



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

B 1,081,379



Walter F. Westbrook
Festival of Humanity
1 January 1893
Richard Congreve.

POLITICAL, SOCIAL, AND RELIGIOUS
ESSAYS

•

•

•

•

•

ESSAYS

POLITICAL, SOCIAL, AND RELIGIOUS

BY

RICHARD CONGREVE

VOL. II.

LONDON
REEVES AND TURNER

1892

AC
8
.C77
V.2

01-11-11

KENNY & CO., PRINTERS,
25, CAMDEN ROAD, CAMDEN TOWN, LONDON, N.W.

ADVERTISEMENT.

In 1874 I published a reprint of what I had written in connection with Positivism during the preceding eighteen years. The present volume reproduces the publications of the subsequent eighteen years (1874-1892).

In this reprint, as in the other, I introduce no alterations. The political or social events of the period comprised may have been such as to justify or demand a certain change in the judgments expressed, but I think it best to leave what I wrote as it originally stood. It thus becomes a more truthful record of the estimate of passing events formed on Positivist principles.

In the more personal parts I pursue the same course, though time may have modified the first impressions. With the exception of one note all remains as it was.

The table of contents prefixed sufficiently explains the general arrangement of the volume.

My aim has been the same throughout: to spread the Religion of Humanity, the cause in which I have now laboured for thirty-six years.

With all imperfections of statement or judgment I cannot but hope that this volume, as its predecessor, will show that the conceptions due to that Religion, as founded and proclaimed by Auguste Comte, enable its disciples to form a firm and consistent estimate of contemporaneous thought and action, as well as to indicate clearly the tendencies which underlie their shifting upper currents.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

Palace Gardens Terrace, W.

14 Charlemagne, 104 (30th June, 1892.)

62-111111

KENNY & CO., PRINTERS,
25, CAMDEN ROAD, CAMDEN TOWN, LONDON, N.W.

ADVERTISEMENT.

In 1874 I published a reprint of what I had written in connection with Positivism during the preceding eighteen years. The present volume reproduces the publications of the subsequent eighteen years (1874-1892).

In this reprint, as in the other, I introduce no alterations. The political or social events of the period comprised may have been such as to justify or demand a certain change in the judgments expressed, but I think it best to leave what I wrote as it originally stood. It thus becomes a more truthful record of the estimate of passing events formed on Positivist principles.

In the more personal parts I pursue the same course, though time may have modified the first impressions. With the exception of one note all remains as it was.

The table of contents prefixed sufficiently explains the general arrangement of the volume.

My aim has been the same throughout: to spread the Religion of Humanity, the cause in which I have now laboured for thirty-six years.

With all imperfections of statement or judgment I cannot but hope that this volume, as its predecessor, will show that the conceptions due to that Religion, as founded and proclaimed by Auguste Comte, enable its disciples to form a firm and consistent estimate of contemporaneous thought and action, as well as to indicate clearly the tendencies which underlie their shifting upper currents.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

Palace Gardens Terrace, W.

14 Charlemagne, 104 (30th June, 1892.)

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
ADDRESS TO THE CHINESE AMBASSADORS	1
VIVISECTION	4
ENGLAND AND TURKEY	7
ENGLAND'S POLICY	31
THE PRINCE IMPERIAL	32
BURMAH	33
THE EASTERN QUESTION	35
THE TRANSVAAL	37
THE IRISH CRISIS	39
THE FATE OF ARABI	43
POSITIVIST PROTEST AGAINST THE WAR IN THE SOUDAN	44
EASTERN EUROPE AND BULGARIA	46
MR. PARNELL'S POSITION	52
NATIVE INDIAN GOVERNMENT	60
MISCELLANEOUS PAPERS ON POSITIVIST ACTION:—	
LA REVUE OCCIDENTALE	71
MY ANSWER TO DR. BRIDGES (<i>Note added</i>)	75
CORRESPONDENCE WITH M. EMILE LAPORTE	86
" " M. PIERRE LAFFITTE	89
SERIALS:—	
1.—A CHAPTER OF THE EARLY HISTORY OF POSITIVISM	92
2.—THE PRESENT OF POSITIVISM	96
3.—THE QUESTION OF THE STUDY OF THE <i>Philosophie Positive</i>	100
4.—{ IMPERIALISM (<i>Mr. H. Crompton</i>)	105
POSITIVIST ACTION IN ENGLAND	112
5.—THE OPIUM TRADE AND THE INDIAN REVENUE.	115
6.—THE QUESTION OF THE TWO POWERS—SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE	120
7.—IRELAND	128
8.—IN MEMORIAM: DWARKA NATH MITTER	138
9.—IN MEMORIAM: DR. ARTHUR C. BURNELL	146
10.—{ THE CONVICTION FOR BLASPHEMY (<i>Mr. H. Crompton</i>)	158
THE CHANNEL TUNNEL	162
11.—CENTRES OF SPIRITUAL ACTIVITY IN LONDON— CHURCH OF HUMANITY (POSITIVIST SCHOOL)	165
12.—{ BURIALS	171
OATHS	173
13.—THE LABOUR QUESTION:—	
I. LETTER FROM A FRENCH WORKING MAN ON THE PRESENT STRIKE	177
II. REPORT ON THE LABOUR QUESTION PRESENTED TO THE POSITIVIST SOCIETY	184
14.—I. IN MEMORIAM: JOHN GREENE MILLS	193
II. REPRINT OF A REVISED EDITION OF HIS TRANSLA- TION OF POSITIVIST PRAYERS BY JOSEPH LONCHAMPT	198
15.—BURMAH	221

CONTENTS.

ANNUAL ADDRESSES ON THE FESTIVAL OF HUMANITY:—		PAGE
YEAR 87 (1875)	HUMAN CATHOLICISM I.	225
" 88 (1876)	" " II.	254
" 89 (1877)	" " III.	290
" 90 (1878)	RELIGION OF HUMANITY	321
" 91 (1879)	" "	358
" 92 (1880)	" "	384
" 93 (1881)	" "	404
" 94 (1882)	" "	427
" 95 (1883)	" "	451
" 96 (1884)	" "	476
" 97 (1885)	THE WILL AND CONSCIOUSNESS OF HU- MANITY	499
" 98 (1886)	THE POWER OF HUMANITY	523
" 99 (1887)	CONFIDENCE IN HUMANITY	544
" 100 (1888)	HUMANITY AS THE VIRGIN-MOTHER	567
" 102 (1890)	THE NEW, THE HIGHER, LIFE IN HUMANITY COMMEMORATION OF THE DEAD	584
" "	" "	604
" 103 (1891)	HUMANITY THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD	616
" 104 (1892)	THE RECOGNITION OF HUMANITY	640
ADDRESSES IN COMMEMORATION OF AUGUSTE COMTE'S DEATH:—		
1.—24 GUTENBERG 90 (5 SEPTEMBER, 1878)		661
2.—DE PROPAGANDA FIDE: YEAR 91 (1879)		682
3.—RETROSPECT—THE INFLUENCE OF AUGUSTE COMTE'S LIFE AND TEACHING: YEAR 94 (1882)		703
ADDRESS IN COMMEMORATION OF AUGUSTE COMTE'S BIRTHDAY:		
19 MOSES 102 (19 JANUARY, 1890)		722
THE SACRAMENT OF INCORPORATION: JAMES CRUICKSHANK GEDDES, 22 FREDERIC 99 (26 NOVEMBER, 1887)		
		735
APPENDIX: COMMEMORATIVE ADDRESS, 1880		
		755
ACT OF COMMEMORATION		
		765
CIRCULAR OF 28 ST. PAUL 90 (17 JUNE, 1878). (<i>French and English</i>)		
		766
ANNUAL CIRCULARS FOR THE YEARS 91-104 (1879-92):—		
FIRST (<i>French and English</i>)		787
SECOND " "		798
THIRD " "		807
FOURTH (<i>English and French</i>)		816
FIFTH " "		827
SIXTH (<i>English</i>) " "		836
SEVENTH " "		843
EIGHTH " "		851
NINTH " "		858
TENTH " "		866
ELEVENTH " "		875
TWELFTH " "		887
THIRTEENTH " "		898
FOURTEENTH " "		908
TRANSLATIONS OF CORRESPONDENCE (<i>See pp. 86—91</i>)		
		917

ADDRESS TO THE CHINESE AMBASSADORS.

To their Excellencies the Envoys from the Imperial Court of China, Kuo, Chief Minister, Vice-President of the Board of Rites, and Lui, Assistant Ambassador, of the third official grade, Ching Tong, on the staff of the Province of Chihli.

Their Excellencies will, we hope, allow us, in welcoming them to England as the representatives of China, the oldest and vastest of human civilisations, to express our pleasure that, whatever the immediate occasion, their Government has seen fit to enter on direct diplomatic relations in Europe with our own, on the same footing as the powers which are our more immediate neighbours. We remember that with a wise foresight, fully justified by the event, the Chinese Government, at an earlier period, wished to keep the intercourse of its people with Europeans on a purely commercial footing. But the wish was set aside, and as a consequence we have witnessed, during upwards of forty years, constant encroachments on an unaggressive nation, war following war, on various pretexts, but in no case on grounds justifiable by fair international morality.

This conduct on our part, which, as Englishmen, we deplore and condemn, has necessitated a change in the action of the Chinese Imperial Government; and we hope that their Excellencies' presence amongst us is an indication that the Court which they represent acquiesces in that change, and is prepared permanently to maintain an Embassy in England; that China will henceforth, that is, claim to enter on equal terms the circle of European nations, and to be treated in all respects as they are treated, with the full recognition of her imperial rights, and to the entire removal of any oppressive conditions which her isolation rendered it possible for superior force to impose upon her.

We wish, that is to say, that their Excellencies may press, and successfully, for the revision of all treaties relating to the opium traffic, with a view to its total cessation, as a trade at once degrading to England and injurious to the best interests

2 ADDRESS TO THE CHINESE AMBASSADORS.

of China, from its demoralizing influence upon her population. In their exertions to secure this object, we can assure their Excellencies that they have a large and increasing body in this country on whose support and aid they can count. There is a wide-spread feeling that in this respect their country has suffered grievous wrong at our hands.

We wish, secondly, that the policy pursued in matters of general trade by our nation towards China, a policy dictated by our commercial classes, and weakly acquiesced in by our Governments, may be modified so as to lose its present overbearing and intrusive character and to be placed on a fair footing, with full respect for the independence of China and its just freedom of action.

Thirdly, we wish for the abandonment by England of the oppressive doctrine of extra-territoriality, and the dangerous claim made in connection with it of unrestricted access to all parts of the vast Chinese Empire. We recognise the justice and the wisdom of due restrictions on such access, by which too often the insolent and undisciplined Western populations are brought into undue contact with manners, habits, and feelings which they cannot understand and do not care to conciliate, and therefore are almost certain to offend. China should be free as other States—Russia for instance—to fix the terms on which it admits foreigners; and if such foreigners cannot submit to the laws of China, it is not desirable that they should penetrate into her territories.

Fourthly, we hope that China will press with energy on the Government to which their Excellencies are accredited, the duty of strongly discountenancing all attempts to thrust upon China our material civilisation, our railways, etc.; appliances good in themselves, but which should not be forced upon any, and which it may require great caution in introducing—the duty of aiding the Chinese Government in putting down such unwarrantable encroachments as that which has been noticed lately, the laying down of the Woosung Railway in defiance of the Imperial authorities.

Lastly, we wish for the withdrawal by England of all official support and countenance from the various missionaries who seek to introduce into China the existing religion of the West. Whilst regretting the disturbance that any success

ADDRESS TO THE CHINESE AMBASSADORS. 3

on their part must cause, and confidently hoping that the healthy tendencies of the Chinese national mode of thought will be strong enough to make any large success impossible, we feel that, if unsupported by force, and left entirely to the action of the Chinese nation and Government, such evil as is attendant on their presence the Imperial Government will be competent to meet, at the same time, that it would be fully justified in their exclusion if found too obnoxious. Their Excellencies' previous judgment as to the inutility for China of Western Christianity will doubtless receive ample confirmation from observation of its divisions and decay, as it presents itself in Europe.

In a word, we hope that their Excellencies' mission may conduce to the securing for their country a juster, more respectful, consideration on the part of ours, which has hitherto so signally failed both in justice and respect. We address their Excellencies because we would make it clear that there are Englishmen who unhesitatingly blame their country's misconduct, and are ready by all means in their power to make atonement for it. We may truly say that we have never lost an opportunity of trying to awaken a better feeling, of enforcing a more noble policy. We shall always be ready to continue the same course, and to co-operate, to the utmost of our ability, with all, whether our fellow-countrymen here, or our fellow-men in China, towards the amelioration of the relations of England with the great empire which constitutes so large a portion of the human race.

With our best wishes for its prosperity, and for their Excellencies' welfare and success, we beg them to accept this our address, expressive, we hope, of the common human feeling which should bind together all the separate nations, and inspired by a religion which has no closer affinities with any of those which are accepted by mankind, than it has with the true indigenous religion of China, that which we associate with the honoured name of Confucius.

We have the honour to remain,
Their Excellencies' obedient Servants.

1877.

Signed by the English Positivists.

VIVISECTION.

Sharing in the feeling against vivisection, which is strong and general, we wish to take part in the movement against it, and on the following grounds.

The practice is supported on the plea that it is essential to sound physiological teaching; and, secondly, that it is a necessary instrument of original research—that biology, as an experimental science, requires a large use of experiment.

The first plea we reject as untenable. We do not consider that the student, medical or strictly scientific, requires the aid of vivisection for attaining the mastery of the science which he needs for his subsequent course. Competent teachers can give him the knowledge he wants, and it is wise for him as a student to accept their teaching, subject to revision at a later stage. Further, the reliance on this visual observation, so loudly urged at present, has, we think, a tendency to weaken the higher powers of the mind, to interfere with the reasoning process in its more active form. It is but developing this consideration to say that biology as a science, in what it teaches, and in the way in which it teaches, should be guided, so far, that is, as it uses methods not its own, not by the more experimental sciences of which physics are the type, but by the less experimental, and especially by that which immediately follows it, the social science, where experiment, in the strict sense and as ordinarily understood, has no place; hence a rooted objection to the new institution—we speak of England,—of physiological laboratories, a term appropriate for the chemist, but not for the biologist.

As an instrument of original research vivisection stands on a somewhat different footing. It has unquestionably been useful in the past. We think that, under most careful restrictions, it may on rare occasions be needed in the future. But the results already attained in biology ought to render its employment more and more infrequent. And the most

important branch of enquiry, that which relates to the cerebral functions, is the one in which we think other methods most applicable, the method of vivisection most uncertain and most unfruitful.

On several grounds we are still more opposed to its employment at all as an instrument of teaching, and call for its most guarded employment by the scientific enquirer. We object to any such addition to the hardening process of intellectual training as is involved in the constant familiarity with animal suffering, and we consider this objection to hold very forcibly even when the student is no longer a mere youth.

We object to it as an abuse of our power over the animals whose chief man has gradually risen to be—a power which is limited both by our own moral nature and by the kindred nature of these animals. We lay down no absolute doctrine. Some animal races are inconsistent with man—the poisonous snakes, for instance—and these he exterminates; but he might not, if he could, torture them. All others, whether indifferent or useful, he should protect from needless injury, and use with merciful care, inflicting no avoidable suffering where some suffering is inevitable. This leads us to the limited use of vivisection. We think that man, who takes animal life so freely for his food, may occasionally inflict suffering for the purpose of clearing up his scientific knowledge; that in some cases, when a definite problem is before us—not therefore as a means of chance discoveries—if on careful investigation it appear that such problem, given its sufficient importance, would probably be solved at the cost of some animal suffering, it would be legitimate to exact that suffering. These conditions would evidently limit the practice indefinitely.

We do not call for penal legislation on the subject—allowing, however, that there is a distinction to be drawn as to teaching and research in regard to such legislation—but would prefer trusting to the power of opinion to check the growing practice, and to restrict it within its due and most narrow limits.

For the purposes of scientific biology, as for the purposes of the medical art, there exists, as has been pointed out, a

large store of experiment in the phenomena of disease which are unfortunately too abundant. The rational use of these might, we think, in most cases, be sufficient for all our wants—not impossibly in all cases. It may be a more laborious process to confine ourselves to these natural experiments, but it is intellectually and morally a much more satisfactory course.

We are aware that to some all this will appear mere sentiment, that to some the importance of scientific knowledge, what is termed the pursuit of truth, appears the one paramount aim. We do not accept this. We hold that there may be knowledge attainable by man which he should reject because of the means by which he is to attain it. He would be purchasing it too dearly by the sacrifice of higher considerations. We hold that social and moral direction is a far more important object than scientific inquiry, even in the highest sciences—sociology and morals.

In reference to these higher subjects we may add generally that the weight attached to this form of experiment in biology is an indication of more than one erroneous tendency. It ignores the truth that the really valuable knowledge of man cannot be learnt by the study of him in his most isolated, but in his social existence. It is therefore a misdirection of the energies alike of the biologist and of the physician. It is the continuance, in a time when it has ceased to be appropriate, of a form of investigation which had its use under very different conditions. The result is to divert the attention of many thinkers from the questions which are of sovereign importance—even for biology—and from the settlement of which alone any true progress in biology is now to be looked for—the questions of government, social organization, education and religion.

RICHARD CONGREVE, M.R.C.P.
J. H. BRIDGES, M.B., F.R.C.P.

ENGLAND AND TURKEY.

'Deliver not the tasks of might
To weakness.'

All men of all parties are agreed—as they could not but be, the facts once established—in their judgment on the atrocities in Bulgaria, one of those wild outbreaks of ferocity and lust which show the possible depth of evil in human nature when free from the restraints of social order. I say in human nature, and do not confine it to Turkish nature, as I see there is too much inclination to do under the impulse of the present excitement. 'Highest of all when under control, worst of all animals when without law and justice,'—this judgment on man bears no restrictive application. Our just abhorrence of the actual misdeeds of the Turkish troops seems to me to be hurrying us into unjust judgments and unwise actions.

For whilst I respect the motives of the present movement, and within limits, which have at times been passed, I entirely concur in the indignation expressed, so far as it is the spontaneous expression of a real national feeling in presence of a great wrong, there is much in the language used which I deprecate, much in the conclusions sought to be enforced which I think dangerous, something at any rate in the national attitude which I think unwarranted. Something more of misgiving in this wholesale condemnation of another nation, something more of humility on the score of past events in our own history, something more of the sense of the community of nature between the Turkish people and our own, might have increased the value of our utterance, and invested it with additional promise for the future. Defective, however, as it has been in these respects, it has a promise for the future: it constitutes an obligation which cannot be eluded—the obligation whenever and wherever there be outrages on

our common humanity, and that there will be such is too probable, to reprobate them as we reprobate this present outrage. For instance, whilst we loudly blame the Turkish mode of warfare in Servia, the destruction of villages by fire and the devastation of the country, would it not be well if some voices were raised against our own practice, in the interests of the half-piratical trader too often, of shelling African or other uncivilised populations? or against such acts as in that unjustifiable Ashantee war was the burning of Coomassie? or in China the destruction of the imperial palace?

With a certain reserve, then, I respect the judgment on the past. But it is not with the past we have now to deal, except so far as we can repair it; and I trust the reparation will be of the amplest kind, as it ought to be, considering the easy form which it may take for the majority—that of money contributions. Those who, as Lady Strangford, are willing to give their services in its distribution, should have no difficulty in collecting the sum they ask.

There remains one point in reference to the past in which injustice may be done. It is the responsibility attaching to the Turkish Government—its complicity in these Bulgarian horrors. Governments, as a rule, are ill served by their agents, who too often carry out instructions in a way which those who gave them in no way sanction. There have been exceptions, such as James II. in our own country and that of M. Thiers in France, where there is every reason to think that the mercilessness of the ruler outran that of the subordinates. But the rule is the other way, and the supreme government of Turkey is probably, if we take the statements of the two parties in England, not an exception. No doubt in the hour of danger, with other revolts on its hands and the prospect of the Servian and Montenegrin war, on hearing of the agitation and insurrection in Bulgaria, due, it would appear, to external intrigues, it wished a speedy termination,—what has been so much praised in England,—a vigorous stamping out of the evil at its beginning; but as a central government it does not seem to be further involved in the actual transaction. Like most other governments, it would be slow to recognise the misdeeds of its agents; but

otherwise the fault lies rather in its weakness and actual disorganization, as was justly pointed out by Lord Derby, than in its intentions. That this is the true view is, I think, evidenced by its permitting foreigners to visit the localities and enquire for themselves, and tolerating their presence after their publication of the facts. Would Russia in Poland, the French Government after the suppression of the Commune, or our own Government in the Indian mutiny, have been equally patient? It would seem that no Government has a sufficient hand upon its officers or its population—perhaps never has had, but certainly has not in the present day—a weakness which evidences the want of some more universal, more cogent influence to supplement the action of governments. Look at Barbadoes, or our conduct in Japan, or the dealings with the coolies in the Mauritius, of Queensland with the Oceanians.

And, generalising, how few nations of Europe—is there any one but Italy?—are so clean-handed as to be justified in using unmeasured abuse of Turkey. Nationally, as individually, the true rule, doubtless, is to blame ourselves first before we attack our neighbours: but there are occasions, and such is this reckless denunciation of one people as compared with all others, when we survey the others, and inquire whether history justifies the implication of so complete a disparity, and Poland, Algeria, Hungary, and Spanish America rise in its confutation.

I would gladly not write this, for in the prevalent one-sidedness of judgments, I know to what it exposes me; but when I see the lengths to which a dominant impression carries many in this matter, I feel it incumbent on me not to shrink from incurring any of the risk attendant on an impartial judgment.

In the present we have before us, practically, the choice of two policies, or rather two guidances, that of the existing government and of Mr. Gladstone, who I presume is ready to resume office. I say practically, for others are offered, but have no chance of being accepted. If I allude to Mr. Grant Duff's scheme, his dream he calls it, it is because of some of its accidents, rather than from any wish to discuss it fully. An Anglo-Indian administration under a dignified head—such

is its summary for those who may have missed it. He does not himself give the title of this dignified head, yet it should have been given, or the project lacks definiteness. It is implied that we are to have another Emperor of Western origin.

It seems to me a fresh instance of the corrupting influence of our Indian Empire. The temporary success of that experiment misleads us to the point of thinking that we are able to set the world in order, when it is a question whether we are not breaking down under what we have already undertaken. It would appear to be a postulate of a certain class of minds, that we, and we exclusively, have a peculiar faculty for government of other races; an assumption of the most offensive and dangerous character, and which reposes at bottom on a completely official view of the results attained in our Indian dependency.

I would wish to speak with all due respect of a large body of public servants, of our Anglo-Indian administrative corps; but I have a recollection of certain points in our history there, in times of order and disorder equally, which suggest many objections to the proposal we have before us. Seriously, was the suppression of the Indian mutiny, even with what facts we have, and all competent students allow that many are yet unknown, that a full picture of the horrors of that suppression is for future generations—was, I ask, the suppression of that mutiny so conducted that we could with decency propose that the service which conducted it should furnish teachers of justice and mercy to the Turks? I know not what the language of the Constantinople governing classes was on the news reaching it of an insurrection in Bulgaria; but I do know something of that of the Calcutta governing community at the time of the Sepoy revolt, and it could not be easily surpassed as an expression of savage and vengeful cruelty. It is due to Lord Canning to say that he was, fortunately, a noble exception.

Or, again, are we to take some Anglo-Indian proconsul of the Dalhousie type, fresh from an unprincipled act of Burman spoliation, committed in defiance of all right under the plea of destiny, and think him a fit apostle to the Turks of moderation, of the duty of resigning this or that possession, of the moral beauty of contracting the red line of empire, of

letting go provinces which their fathers acquired. Nò, at every turn our own past history meets us, not to stop our reasonable and thoughtful action for the better in the present, but to show us the unseemliness of many of our pretensions, and the wisdom of not seeking to increase our responsibilities.

And then the dignified head. Is it seriously proposed to take a young prince, of untried capacity for government—the command of a ship of war is not by any means a particular recommendation, even if well administered—a prince brought up in the blinding influences of the English court, more naturally blinding even than those of aristocratic life, a prince who has in no way produced as yet a favourable impression on a society disposed, as is evident from its tone about the rest of his family, to be most indulgent, and place him in a position requiring the highest gifts for rule, the most accomplished statesmanship? If he is to govern and not reign, the proposal is absurd, and for a constitutional puppet the position is not suited. So much on a point which is difficult to touch. For in the current of servility which has set in of late in favour of our royal family, when only praise is allowed and any blame is thought discreditable, the only refuge for self-respect is silence—where it is possible. I have only said what was necessary to clear me from any participation in the prevailing adulation which oppresses many besides myself with a sense of shame.

But of the two guides who are feasible, I will take Mr. Gladstone first. In adopting any one as a leader we naturally look to his antecedents. It is a time for free speech on such points. Mr. Gladstone's own language is very free. Dazed by a revolting act, which shocks all of us as much as it does him, he seems to have lost his equilibrium, and to be hurrying himself and the nation on very dangerous courses? What reason have we to follow him?

By a passionate appeal to the humanity and honour of England he is thrusting a particular policy upon the Government and practically wresting the conduct of affairs out of its hands. Are we to prefer him to his rivals as the exponent of those powerful motives? I think he has in his vehemence been too forgetful of his past.

Others, Mr. Beesly for instance, have drawn attention to

the weakness of his position, on a survey of the past. I concur with them, and in the judgment that he has been weak towards the strong, strong towards the weak, silent when Russia or the Versailles government were in question, violent against Naples and Turkey. What more feeble than his list of our national misdeeds given at Greenwich? It is easy to balance an account in your favour if you omit important items, and why were India and Ireland left out of Mr. Gladstone's list? If introduced, would they have warranted his conclusion? I cannot forget, either, his sympathy with the slaveholder which led him to raise his voice on the side of the South in the great American contest. Yet what is slavery, as an industrial not domestic institution, in any case, French, Spanish, Portuguese, English or Dutch? It is on their most revolting side, that of lust, the Bulgarian horrors in permanence. Female honour is not for the slave. So true is it that one great critical suffering affects our imagination and arouses our sympathy, when the slow enduring evil under which generation after generation is borne down passes comparatively unnoticed.

Nor is the honour of England so compromised, whatever Mr. Gladstone may say, by what has happened in Bulgaria, as by numerous other parts of her conduct. It was far more palpably at stake in Jamaica, India, and that semi-Indian outrage, the Abyssinian raid. It is so in our opium policy in China, in our oppression of Burmah. There is ample field in these last for Mr. Gladstone's solicitude about it. Not that I object to his speaking in this present emergency, but there is that in the way in which he speaks as against the Government, which such reminiscences should prevent, and they are introduced to justify the withholding of our confidence.

Graver still—if we consider all that it involves—is the retrospect of his foreign policy. In thinking of him as the possible director of our foreign policy, are we warranted by his antecedents in hoping much from him? I put aside the curious act by which he would begin, an act, as Mr. Grant Duff justly observes, of direct war upon Turkey—a somewhat intemperate opening.

I turn to the past. If we may judge by some recriminations which passed between him and the present Premier, his

colleagues and his opponents did not estimate highly his action at the time of the Crimean war.¹ If I remember right, the attack was warded by a remark that at that period he did not take much interest in foreign politics. But during his own Premiership such interest was forced upon him, and his then policy was, I must think, disastrous, and at the root of much of the present difficulty. It fell to him to steer England through the crisis of the Franco-German war; and the general judgment at home and abroad was, and is, that he failed gravely. The temporary effacement of England—such is the expression which presents the position he gave his country, to the imperilling for long years of European concert, and to the necessitating his actual adoption of an unsound policy. It shows the short memory, or the inattention, or the excessive good nature of the nation, that it should be possible for the idea to arise, that a statesman so tried and so found wanting could be entrusted with the highest power.

As it is, owing to the unfortunate blunder of Germany in 1871 and to the tame acquiescence of Europe in her pretensions, the Russo-Prussian combination has been encouraged to think itself the ultimate appeal, free to act as it pleased in reference to eastern Europe. The present policy of Mr. Gladstone, so far as we gather it from his speeches, would favour its claims. His compliments all round must be taken for what they are worth; but his action would be to rely on Russia mainly in the arrangement with Turkey. I would make no hobgoblin of Russia; but it is excusable to doubt whether in the game of Eastern complications Mr. Gladstone would be a match for Prince Gortschakoff.

Be this as it may, he avows that he looks to the joint action of England and Russia in the present emergency, and there is a large school which would follow him in this. Let me indicate one objection *in limine* to this policy. I assume that Mr. Gladstone, if in power, would not carry out the wilder scheme of those who are at his back, nor seek to eject

¹ In judging the Crimean War we are too apt to confound two distinct series of events, the protection of Turkey from Russian encroachment, and the aggression upon Russia herself by sending our forces to the

Crimea. It is this latter which is properly the Crimean War, and which is a fair object of censure, as in every respect an unwise venture, with no good prospect. The former is and was justifiable on all grounds.

the Turks by violence from Europe, nor sanction Russia in doing so. I assume, that is,—as I interpret his language, I am warranted in assuming—that he so far accepts the ‘as you were’ policy, as to look for modifications of the Turkish rule compatible with its existence. Now, Russia has been almost from its earliest entry into European politics the standing aggressor on Turkey, constantly encroaching on her, constantly domineering over her, in no ambiguous manner posing as her successor. Relatively Turkey is inferior in strength to Russia, and has witnessed with just alarm the growth of her opponent, and submitted, but with just indignation, to her dictatorial language. It is possible—Mr. Gladstone’s faith is strong in her, but I should have thought Lord Granville’s experience might have weakened it;—it is possible that Russia has abandoned her traditional policy and speaks merely in the interests of justice and humanity. Her conduct in Servia is singularly against this great change in her. She could, it is silly to doubt it, have stopped her officers and soldiers from turning a Servian into a Russian attack on Turkey. But it is not in the nature of things that Turkey should accept without repugnance the influence of Russia. What she could yield honourably to the union of the Western powers—of Europe in the true sense—she would bitterly resent if imposed upon her by her haughty rival. Where it is possible to avoid rousing a not unwarranted suspicion and irritation, it is surely wise to do so, and it is so in this case, if we mingle as little as may be Russia with our action. With the wisest attempering, that action will be galling enough to the self-love of the Ottoman nation; it is but fair and also more prudent, more hopeful of result, to conciliate to the uttermost its feelings.

Turning to the Government in whose hands we actually are, it is not needful to examine with equal fulness its claims or its merits in the past. Mr. Gladstone tends, I do not say seeks, to supplant it; and we would know why. It is in power, and all that is necessary is to see whether it be so far inferior to the substitute offered as at a critical moment to make it imperative to change it. In point of humanity, no one would accuse the members of the existing Government of being less sensible to the Bulgarian horrors than any other

men who have read them. In their position a certain amount of reticence was necessary, as I cannot but think there is a similar obligation resting on the leaders of the Opposition, who are always possible ministers.

For their general record, it is not better, so far as I can see, nor worse, than Mr. Gladstone's. They have condoned all the wrongs which he has condoned, have shared in the national misdoings as largely as he; possibly rather more. Here and there, as in his case, there have been exceptions. But in general, what I think Mr. Spencer calls the bias of patriotism has had free play with the present ministers' as with their assailants, and the dictates of humanity and the exigencies of our country's honour in reference to them have been far too much ignored. And I fear will be ignored; for with the present Premier's oriental proclivities, which lead him to cling so strongly to our Indian empire that he has saddled us with that odious title of *Empress of India*, there is little hope of a moderate, really humane policy in the East. And in the West the affair of Luxemburg, and their silence during the Franco-German war, are far from reassuring. Yet with all deductions, I think the general opinion has been hitherto, and there seems no reason to doubt should continue to be, that so far as regards the honour of England—a very delicate ground to tread on—it is safer with the actual Government than with its predecessor. They seem less smitten with that curious defect which is traceable in so many of the economical school of statesmen—the men who look to exports and imports as the one test of national well-being—the defect of any historical conception, any constant sense of the importance of a well-matured foreign policy.

At any rate, the ministers who now direct our foreign action have not been exposed to the trial, and have therefore escaped the failure of their predecessors, and there is so far more ground for hope that they will carry us well through the present storm. All that has hitherto appeared warrants—broadly speaking—this conclusion. It is much that they have not lost their self-possession, and that they venture, in contact with this present tumult, to weigh the real merits of the case, and to risk no rash judgments. It is refreshing to turn to their speeches after those of their assailants: I allude

to Lord Derby's and Sir Stafford Northcote's. On the details of their actions it is very dangerous for a private citizen to enter, but I cannot but think—speaking only of the act so far as it is open to public cognisance—that their refusal of the Berlin Memorandum was a wise measure. It was most desirable, if England was to speak with effect in the councils of Europe, to show that she in no way looked on herself as taken in tow by the imperial combination of Eastern Europe—that she was an independent power, choosing her own time and mode of action—that she was no longer effaced, but present and to be reckoned with. Such an attitude is the first condition of better things—that it will be the first step towards them, this must remain uncertain. So again, the sending of her fleet to Besika Bay, and that in great force, merits the applause it gained. On the particular combination of motives I have no call to enter. But its presence there, yes, in some sense as the ally of Turkey, if only the Government use it rightly, is again a necessary preliminary to a sound intervention—obviating, probably, many embarrassments.

With Mr. Gladstone—I am happy to note my agreement,—and perhaps before Mr. Gladstone, I think the prestige of England a mischievous and immoral idea. I renounce all care for England's selfish interests. I invite him to carry out his renunciation to its fair consequences. But with him, too, I make no doubt, I wish England strong and respected. It is for the interest of Europe and Humanity that it should be so. I welcome, by the way, the more frequent introduction of this term Humanity, the implicit recognition of its reality, in contradistinction to, and yet on the same footing with, other smaller, but avowedly real, aggregations of men. I wish, I have ever wished, that England should be as strong as she was under Cromwell, but without any of the aggressive tendencies which vitiated the great Protector's foreign policy; and it is because I think that the measures of the present Government are calculated to replace her in a position in which she may be signally useful, and so repair the mischief wrought by a feebler administration, that I do what I can in its support. Statesmanship must be a balance of evils in many cases, and it is often necessary to prefer a general

result of permanent value to the removal of even deplorable immediate evils. Were it, then, shown that certain incidental evils accompanied the action of the Government, it would not be its conclusive condemnation.

But, of course, all depends ultimately on the use made of a strong position ; and any interpretation of the Ministry's conduct must be subject to their future action. What their intentions and policy may be, we have almost of necessity to wait for. Any criticism solely concerns the past and passing events. What is to be wished for—in other words, what the policy of England should be—this is the question on which I now enter.

I have already said that from the school which gravitates towards Russia I wholly dissent ; and I have dwelt on the peculiar inappropriateness of calling her in in the treatment of Turkey. What is there in the past history or present condition of Russia that should make her an object of our political preferences ? Within her own sphere, and in the arduous task of raising her population and wisely administering her already unwieldy empire, there is every reason to wish her well, and when possible to aid her ; but her continued expansion can be no object to any one. She has not shown in Poland any peculiar ability in dealing with a more advanced people which was sacrificed to her ambition ; why should she be competent to rule wisely the Rouman or the Greek ? Her population was within these twenty years serf, and the dispositions of her ruling classes and her emancipated peasants are not likely to have been so modified from what they were during the long continuance of serfage as to make them suitable rulers and guides of others. Was the condition of the serfs in Russia much, if any, better than that of the rayahs under Turkish rule ? There is every reason to doubt it. Ruling classes which so recently held their inferiors in such dependence as, I believe, existed in Russia, must take time to unlearn their habits, as must those who have so long crouched to learn the habits of freemen. It is not a quarter of a century that, under the conditions of Russia, intellectually and morally, will undo the work of generations.

Again, the religious organisation of Russia singularly

disqualifies her for dealing aright with the various Christian populations of the Turkish empire. Nowhere is the spiritual power so completely fused with the temporal—God and Cæsar so inseparable. It is clear from recent events that there is in Islam even less of this intimate blending of the two powers. If allowed, not to encourage in the interest of her own policy the discontent of the Christians, but really to incorporate them in her empire, where would be the freedom which they now enjoy under the Moslem toleration, contemptuous toleration I grant, but still toleration? From its acute perception of this feature in Russian policy, a perception sharpened by her experience in Poland, the Roman Catholic Church sides with the Turk as against the Christian Russians, with a more just estimate of the value of their Christianity than many of us have who suffer ourselves to be misled by that vague term. But even were there no such objections, why should the various divisions of the southern population — Roumans, Bulgarians, Servians, Bosnians, Greeks, Turks, &c.—why should they come under Russian domination and swell the forces of the Panslavic movement. We must acquiesce in the inevitable; but a wise policy will, I conceive, not forward any vast Slavonian aggregate, which, under present circumstances and feelings, may be a most serious danger to Germany, and through her to European peace. New powers, conscious of strength, and impelled only by an instinct of growth, are not wisely encouraged by neighbours at whose expense they must grow, especially when they can offer no contribution of value. If with such a power, unwisely developed, Germany were in hostility, the struggle were most deplorable for both. If she were in unison with it, she would lose rather than gain by the contact, and the combination would be most formidable for all Western Europe.

It is in my judgment, the true interest, both for themselves and for Europe, of the subject states of Turkey at present to remain so, always under the supposition that a tolerable existence is given them. Even for Bosnia and Herzegovina, where the difficulty is greatest, and another solution the most defensible, I, for one, should acquiesce in the judgment of the powers if they found some arrangement

by which their connection with Turkey remained unsevered. For Bulgaria, I should deprecate its severance, even to the extent to which the two former might be separated. The unwise impatience of Servia goes to show that her comparative independence was premature. It was never given her that she might be a fire-brand in Europe and be made the instrument of an unjustifiable war. Sufficient control for the present must be allowed the imperial state to prevent such dangers.

I hope, then, that, in no spirit of opposition to Russia, but guided by the whole antecedents of our past history, England will not rely on her mainly, nor at all, in her action towards Turkey, but will, as befits a great Western power, look to the other Western powers, France, Italy, Austro-Hungary, Germany—(I wish I could add Spain, in fact I would add Spain—and the other Western powers would be wise in inviting her concurrence—in replacing Spain, as Italy was placed in 1856, at the council table of Europe)—for her legitimate coadjutors in the task of modifying Turkish misgovernment. It is difficult to redeem the past, and such a concert of all is well-nigh hopeless, but a firm and patient policy might do much to re-establish the union which on a former occasion proved so effective and to make it the basis for a further reunion of the West. Combined more immediately with France and Italy, the two powers which before rescued Turkey, England with them might address the Porte in the name of the obligation then contracted, and concert with her such a scheme as might effectually remove the evils complained of, so far as governmental action can remove them, securing for her subject peoples the orderly administration under which they might grow to be capable of self-direction. No one of these three powers could be suspected of any design of occupying the empire they were protecting; they would not, therefore, in combination give any legitimate umbrage to their European compeers. They have lost twenty years, but this is not fatal; it is a short period in a nation's history. They may take up the work which they should have done twenty years ago.

If it was possible then—and all assume that it was—it is possible now, so to act on Turkey as to render her internal

government essentially tolerable. It is not for me to sketch in detail the measures which would effect this. I can only register the fact that all the language used by the denunciators of Turkey does assume that such measures might have been taken, and that our responsibility for recent occurrences consists in their not having been taken. Some things would have to be undone. Is there not, for instance, a considerable burden resting on Europe in regard to the powers it has claimed for its consuls in Turkey? Has there not been much disorganization consequent on our overbearing assertion of the rights of our fellow-citizens, in defiance of the just claims of the Porte to self-direction. I mention these points because I think that the intervening powers would be bound to show the greatest possible respect for the independent action of Turkey, forbearing all unnecessary evidence of their influence, and conciliating, where possible, by a wise return on the past.

The union of the three powers first named for joint action on Turkey—with no wish to exclude the others, with every wish rather to have their co-operation—is, I must think, more in keeping with past history and with the present interests of Europe than would be the one against which I am arguing; and, lastly, it would surely be more agreeable to the power most immediately concerned. Nor can I imagine that, if properly addressed, either France or Italy would stand aloof from such a combination. It would tend, as I have before hinted, to strengthen the unstable equilibrium of Europe, and in the best way, by calling into activity its more advanced portions.

But it implies that I wish the continued existence of European Turkey; and it is this from which the dominant sentiment of the nation, at any rate of the English meetings, is, I suspect, averse. But I think there are grounds for wishing it from many points of view. Whatever the judgment on the arguments urged, I feel still a confident hope that, thanks to the action of our Government, the mad attempt—mad not in the sense that it might not succeed, but on a forecast of the evils it would entail in the succeeding, and after the success—will not at present be made: the attempt, I mean, forcibly to eject the Turks. So that we may well hope for time for discussion of the problem.

I deprecate, as I have said, even the bag and baggage theory, the total withdrawal, that is to say, of Bulgaria from Turkish rule, where it is said that the immediate past has made its continuance impossible. May we not take a hint from a disagreeable episode in our own history? The closest parallel with the Turkish suppression of the Bulgarian insurrection is afforded by our own suppression of the Irish rebellion of 1798. I wonder how many of the speakers at these public meetings have studied the records of that event. They are not difficult of access; and had they been known, some of those speakers must have modified their denunciations—not so much of the particular atrocities, as of the nation and government under which they were perpetrated. The Irish horrors followed, with a short and brighter interval, a long period of oppressive misgovernment which we too easily condone—the period of the celebrated penal laws. They led to the Act of Union, and by no indirect consequence to a different treatment of Ireland. Its full adoption was delayed for a generation, but it was in the series of the consequences of the rebellion, and was forced on by that event. May we not hope similarly that, horrible as were the misdoings in Bulgaria, they may issue, with the temperate aid of Europe as above indicated, in securing for that province a really ameliorated government. Nations, like individuals, are aroused by some great crisis or sin, and amendment may be the consequence. Certain it is, that if length of failure be a ground for immediate expulsion, it was more applicable to us in reference to Ireland than to Turkey in Bulgaria. For both alike I wish, I believe in, ultimate independence. I reprobate for both all language, I dissent from all action, which should close this prospect. I think English statesmen and Turkish statesmen should prepare for and forward its attainment; but when in England we hear it boldly proclaimed, as it was by Mr. Forster, that we never will let Ireland go, can we wonder if in Turkey convulsive efforts are made to hold Bulgaria?

If the provinces are cut entirely loose, left to their own self-government, they are exposed to the probabilities of quarrels with their neighbours, to the almost certainty of intrigues from without. If their existence was disorderly,

either internally or in relation to one another, the great border powers would soon interfere, and once incorporated in one of them they would have but a distant hope of their independence. I believe that Bulgaria, at any rate, feels this, and that with some moderate but real security for a better government they would be glad to be free from foreign intrigues and to nurse themselves for the future. After all there is considerable toleration in the Turkish central government, as is evidenced by the action of the American missionaries and the establishment of schools of the non-dominant faith. In fact, by every account of the condition of Bulgaria, it was, before its unhappy insurrection, healthily growing under the Turkish sway. The want is, a thorough quickening of the central action, so as to check the action of the local administration—a want, be it observed, not peculiar to Turkey. In all countries I fear, in their present moral condition, self-government means scarcely more than the government of the strong, more or less oppressive to the weak; our own country certainly is no exception. Such a quickening of the central administration in Turkey I believe quite possible.

Such is the conclusion I advocate for the various smaller states ulteriorly to issue from the Turkish rule. We cannot at a moment's notice change the relations or undo the effects of centuries. Much of the language applicable to Western Europeans would be out of place in dealing with these Eastern peoples who have not passed through the discipline which modified the West.

But what, leave these Christian populations under Mohammedan rule? The cry comes not from the statesmen on either side, it must be said, though there is too much about the peculiar modification of Islam in the Turk, but it represents, I suspect, much of the feeling which is stirring our country. Nor with many does it stop there. It would go to the utter expulsion of the Turks from Europe, as a contamination of the soil of Christendom, a soil over which none but so-called Europeans should hold sway. I do not share the feeling, quite the contrary; and I think it fraught with most evil consequences in the present, and for a long period of the future.

I proceed to explain myself on this most difficult subject.

The two faiths, the faith of Christ, and the faith of Allah—the religion of St. Paul and the religion of Mohammed—are both to be respected for their services; each has its peculiar merits. If the Eastern creed is simpler and nobler as a doctrine than the Western, the utility of the latter is I think greater, or has been greater, owing to the inheritance it received and the conditions of its propagation. If in some respects, it is unquestionable that the nations of the West are in advance of the Moslems, it is hardly to the difference in their religion that we can fairly impute their superiority. There was a time when the disciples of Islam were distinctly in the van of civilisation, in the points where now they are most behind the West, and there was a time when in all the moral qualities they were certainly not inferior. Even in the fierce wars between the Christian and the Mussulman, neither the physical nor moral preeminence was always on the side of the former. I will take a capital instance. I recall the striking scene when in the city of Jehovah the Crescent and the Cross met in deadly struggle. Christian historians have made no secret of the complete triumph of all the fiercer passions over the precepts of Christianity. They have not hesitated to paint the victors as at least the equals in barbarity of the vanquished. "No age or sex spared, seventy thousand said to have been the number of the victims." This for the darker side of both. On the brighter, the equality, to say the least of it, of some the Moslems had not escaped the fair mind of Sir Walter Scott. He has not scrupled to make the Prince of Scotland inferior to his Moslem rival by virtue of the somewhat brutal contempt which contrasts so unfavourably with Saladin's courteous toleration of an antagonist's faith.

Such being their relation in the past, the two creeds have now for many centuries rested quietly side by side, each directing its own portion of the world. Deliberately, I do not believe any one would wish to revive their hostilities. But does not all this abuse of the Turks tend that way? For at the head of the Moslems, as a political power with certain latent capacities, the Turks have long stood and stand, and unmeasured denunciations may call those latent capacities into action and inflict on the world a war in which fanaticism should be one of the motive powers. I have no fear that any

such risk would be run by a wise pressure of the more friendly Western powers, in the name of the purely human interests of peace, order, and good government; and were there some risk, it might be incumbent on us to confront it, with such aims.

But there is more than this. The alienation of the East from the West, of Asia from Europe, is not diminishing in these later years, but is on the increase rather;—as a result of the coarse and oppressive intrusion of our industrial society, the offensive iteration of our claims to superiority, lastly of our spirit of conquest. I am not speaking of England exclusively. A reaction against us is possible, even probable; and if there is none, yet enforced submission is covert hatred, and all real union of the two worlds is out of the question. At once Asiatic and European, as a consequence of its position and history, the Turkish nation offers us a test of the spirit in which the stronger West is disposed to deal with the more disorganized families of man. It has shown, and its present weakness is largely due to this cause, a wish to enter more completely into the European family and to propagate its influence further eastward. Wise statesmanship, guided by an instinct of what was good for Humanity, for the whole race, would avail itself of this existing intermedium, even though not the best that could be wished, but as the only one ready to hand. Far from seeking to eject the Turks from Europe, it would see in them a means for smoothing the differences between the continents, the races, and the creeds—for breaking down the barriers which now separate the various portions of mankind, and for showing that one common Humanity can override all minor differences. I say not that any statesmanship by itself can effectually secure this result, but it might work towards it with what the past has handed down, rather than under an ill-governed impulse throw aside what we have and launch itself on new and uncertain combinations.

Any such considerations are alien and probably distasteful to the Christian mind. I am addressing mainly what I may call inorganic Christians, not the sagacious organisation of Papal Rome. Yet it is clear that no purely Christian policy can avail us here. The extermination of the Moslems is not

more impossible than is their conversion to the Christian faith, in which they would see—it sounds strangely to Christians—a retrogradation. If there is to be harmony provisionally, we must consult so large a portion of the earth's inhabitants which, and I deplore the fact, grows rapidly; in fact more rapidly than the Christians; the relative growth does not interest me. We must make it manifest that we have a common ground with them, community of interests and feelings; that we in no sense claim to be different beings, and if in any way we are superior, seek only to impart our superiority. We have then to accept and honour their faith as one of the facts of our complex existence, to understand and respect their social organisation, to learn what they have to teach us—and all observers allow that there is something—and to teach what they have to learn. We are told that we ought to shake hands with Russia as a brave and honourable opponent. Most true; but extend the teaching; widen the area of your sympathies. Let Christendom and Islam, also brave and honourable foes in the past, also shake hands and agree to put aside their antagonism. The initiative is and must be with Christendom, with the West. So far no one would contest. If the conclusion is one from which the popular instinct as yet revolts, this only shows how weak we are in toleration—how there still lurks in us, under all our language of peace, the instinct of domination—how, in spite of all our claims to enlightenment, we are animated by a contemptuous intolerance of the convictions of others.

Herein, and in the source from which such feelings spring, the confident presumption of the exclusive truth of the prevalent creed, lies a powerful obstacle to human unity, baffling the wiser counsels of the statesman as well as the aspirations of mankind. Yet not destined to baffle them finally, and all steps towards its removal that are possible should be taken. Least of all should any backward steps be taken, and I much fear that we are in the way to take such backward steps, to shatter one of the combinations which, not the traditional policy of England at present in such disfavour, but the instinctive wisdom of generations of European statesmen has bequeathed us.

But the Turks—if it were only this, that, or the other branch of the Mohammedans, and not the Turks—the one great anti-human specimen of Humanity! Christians surely should be slow to speak so. What becomes of St. Paul's declaration, probably not questioned by Mr. Gladstone, that God has made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth? Such, however, is the decorous and moderate language used by a possible premier of England, the noblest, we are told by Mr. Fawcett in his unworthy speech, and the best of Englishmen, to whom we are to look for guidance in the crisis, and whose accession to power with such an utterance unretracted is well nigh a declaration of war upon Turkey. What a dangerous element is the rhetorical statesman, the man in whom the organ of expression overbalances the higher faculties. Well, the Turks—you must accept them, there they are—approximately twelve millions of men, whom Mr. Gladstone thus attacks. The practical ruler has to deal with existing materials, and were the nation justly designated as above, it is with it that we have to reckon. But the judgment even in the past is entirely overstrained, and in the present it is a pure anachronism—an expression of a mediæval reminiscence, nay, below the level of the highest mediæval conceptions, even when the alarm was yet justifiably strong. I am not called, however, by my argument to defend the Turks when I repudiate such a monstrous exaggeration. I have only to urge that, be they what they may, it is our duty to observe towards them the common human respect, and our duty and our interest to bring them into co-operation with us for the common good. Certain animal races have to be extirpated as irreconcilable with man. It is a sad necessity. Certain races of men have been extirpated, not by Turks, but by colonial Englishmen; others are in process of disappearance; but only one speaker, so far as I have seen, has called for the extirpation of the Turks as we extirpated the wolf, and the human feeling of my countrymen cherishes no such atrocious thought.

They must remain, then, in Europe or out of Europe—another fact of our complex existence—to be recognised as an object for true statesmanship, pending a deeper and more

powerful action. That the fact should be not merely recognised, but welcomed as, with all drawbacks, a valuable element towards solving the difficult problem of the union of mankind—on this I will not insist further.

The essential obstacle to that union lies in the existence of different faiths, and in the moral attitude which that difference ordinarily involves, the opposition between Christianity and Islam being its most capital instance. In the dilapidated state of Christian belief in the rulers of Europe, who cling to it more as a social power than from mental conviction, there ought to be no difficulty in either of these respects; they can, as their predecessors have done, treat the matter on purely human grounds. And the populations at their back will be no real embarrassment if judiciously dealt with, as they are in reality swayed mainly by human motives. The task, therefore, of Western statesmen is far easier in regard to any approximation to Islam, than is that of the Islamic leaders in approaching Christendom. Behind these latter the mass is sincerely animated by an attachment to the dogmas of its creed, so easily comprehended, so capable of taking deep root, so interwoven with all their daily life. Great straightforwardness, great patience, great respect are necessary, both in the chiefs of this mass and in the leaders of the West, in the approaches made to them. With all precautions the progress must be slow; but it is too much in the course of events, in the wants of Humanity, that some union should be effected, for the attempt to fail. It must evidently be first made by those for whom it is the easiest. And the first step is the removal of irritation and alarm—all elements of suspicion. No shadow of a proselytising spirit should be perceptible—not the remotest ground given for thinking their faith attacked or undervalued.

So relative a spirit is a hard thing to reconcile with Christianity. Hence the necessity for its ultimate disappearance as a hindrance to the union so much desired.

But enough on this point. It may be that, as it has been predicted, the Turks will themselves return to Asia, or it may be that, under a nobler faith, they may remain in peaceful juxtaposition with the other co-existent peoples—conquerors and conquered merging in one political body, their past

differences forgotten in present union. So long as they stay where they are, and keep their actual faith, they have a great value, not felt now for the first time, as enforcing the necessity, even within the limits of Europe, of rising into a region above the two antagonist religions of the past. If suddenly we suppose them removed to Asia, this necessary step in human advance might be adjourned, not pressed so immediately on the attention of statesmen. The two continents, already so opposed in common thought, would be in more complete isolation one from the other, and the disposition of the European to contemn and domineer over the Asiatic would not be confronted by a yet considerable European power. Nor, again, would the difficulties their presence creates have been turned to the best account by meeting them and overcoming them; they would have disappeared, but leaving an unsatisfactory sense of want of competence—a discouragement for the future; whereas, rightly solved, they would have been a guarantee of subsequent progress.

Such are some of the considerations which I offer in favour of the *status quo*, wisely modified, and against any abrupt cutting of the knot.

They evidently are not limited to the immediate present, any more than they are based on a view bounded by the immediate past. The ultimate aim being the unity of Humanity, all the intermediate steps must be judged by reference to it. Our advance towards that aim has been continuous in the past when no such goal was recognised, or but faintly recognised, and by few. Now that it has come into more general cognisance and may be made the object of conscious effort, everything that can intensify the continuity of the advance is of importance, every available transmission from the past is to be preserved. Above all, no violent disruption should be tolerated, when it is possible by human foresight to avoid it.

It is in this conservative spirit that I have written, not unduly conservative I hope. For I wish for very large modifications in the state of the subject populations of eastern Europe, and I look for gradual changes in the directions which past changes have taken. But daily does the conviction grow stronger, that in this case as in many

others, we are too exclusively bent on political changes when a change of a different order is the real want—a moral and religious renovation—the fruitful and direct source of social and political changes of which we scarcely now dream.

Acquiescence in very defective political arrangements is often most desirable at the present day. Acquiescence, but with judicious attempts at modification. The first need is to influence the rulers, the dominant powers, be they individuals or nations; to bring home to them their great duty of preparing those they rule for a higher and freer state. Renouncing impatient and premature efforts, the subjects may yet make their rulers feel the necessity of continuous advance, and its safety when such a temper is in the ascendant. So the peaceful co-operation of ruler and ruled in the common work of advance may be best secured. Immediate solutions are too much in request, for they are imperfect and often interfere with the more perfect.

Once let there come a general recognition by the leading minds in all countries—and this is nearer than we think—I say not, of the religion of Humanity, but of the conception, at once ideal and real, of Humanity; that all nations and fragments of nations are but parts of one great family; all bound to concord and union, each in its several local habitation having opportunities and advantages which it can use in the common cause; each bound by the obligation not to disturb the common work by undue claims or impatience under its particular assignment; let this general conception become, as it is becoming, a familiar idea, and a calmer temper must be its immediate outcome. It is but applying to nations the doctrines which all hold wisest for individuals, and such application of moral doctrines is the truest line of progress open to us, it is the subordination of politics to morals.

In the expression she has given to what I hold in the main to have been a noble impulse, England cannot expect to have the admiration of other nations, on account of her past shortcomings—to use the mildest word. But she may earn it, if she persevere in her present sentiments. She has entered on a course, I will hope, from which she will not flinch when, as is probable, she will shortly be tried by some

new iniquity, in regard to China for instance. It will behove her to be on the alert, if she would not be chargeable with being keen-sighted only for the flaws in others. So of her leaders, lay or clerical, in this present outspokenness. In past years they have been remiss. Will they continue to be so? It is one thing, let statesmen and bishops remember, to speak when the popular and even commercial feeling is with you, another when it will be bitterly opposed to you; and I wait for some of my contemporaries, whose names I see appended to letters now, when the hunger for new markets overrides all moral considerations as between nations, or when the lust of imperial aggrandisement renders us deaf to all sense of a higher greatness. I hope that I, and those who with me have hitherto stood alone on such questions, shall for the future be powerfully supported. Such support will be most welcome, however opposed the convictions on which it rests.

The preservation of peace immediately, and a policy tending towards increased union of the divergent elements of the human family, such are the two great objects to aim at. As I think the present Government is bent on the first consciously, and instinctively is promoting the second, I hope it will hold out against the storm and resist the intrusion of countervailing projects. But the storm does not seem to abate, and we may see a new Government, with one of two results—either the disappointment of the hopes of those who have borne it into power, or their gratification by a disturbance of the peace of Europe, and a rekindling of the latent fires of religious hostility. England, as more safe from the proper sufferings of war, should be peculiarly cautious how she leads to them, and great is the responsibility of those statesmen who help her to forget this duty; nor can any indignation, however righteous, diminish this responsibility, if it be allowed to supersede the dictates of calm reason.

ENGLAND'S POLICY.

Exclusive attention to British interests hampers and lowers all our policy. We wish to speak a different language at a time when all who have matured convictions should speak.

What is the duty of England as an European power in presence of the peculiar danger of the moment, which is the arbitrary cancelling of all engagements and the consequent reign of pure force?

Neither Egypt nor India weighs with us, nor do any exclusive maritime claims of our country. We wish as much as any for peace; more than most it would seem, for we wish for it in Asia and Africa, as much as in Europe. We wish as much as any for good government, but a survey of existing governments leads us to despise the hot rhetoric which is misleading opinion till but one government seems bad, and we desire the application of calm statesmanship to the task of securing such good government.

The ground thus cleared, without wasting time on regret for lost opportunities of a better action, but in strict reference to the immediate want, we desire to express our conviction, that in the interest of European order, our Government should act with vigour to uphold this simple principle: that treaty arrangements between the Powers of Europe in Congress assembled are binding till deliberately modified by those Powers; are not to be torn up, that is, at the will of one Power.

We desire to be quite clear—so we say that we think that the Government would be amply justified in maintaining this principle by war.

Signed on behalf of the Positivist Society,

RICHARD CONGREVE.

17, MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, W.C.

4 Homer, 90 (1 February, 1878).

THE PRINCE IMPERIAL.

From pulpit and press, from what is called society generally, there comes an expression of grief and honour on the death of this young man. How far it is sincere, how far it is dictated by a kindly human motive, I stop not to inquire. It is very general, it is said to be unanimous—most falsely, as I know. Therefore I say these few words, for there is a moral judgment at stake.

In a singularly unjust war Louis Napoleon chooses to join: accidentally he meets his death. What justified his conduct? He was not fighting in defence of his country. He was not helping the weak against the strong. What motive, I say not, deserving of honour, but exempt from blame, can we find for him? The utmost that can be urged is that he was young and craved action, and found war the easiest action, indifferent to the right or wrong of the case. He has on this, the most favourable supposition, paid a just penalty for his error. Let him rest in peace and silence, and at once; fortunate so far that, with bad traditions and prospects, he is spared the evil possibilities attendant on a Napoleon.

Our nation has no concern with him. Its respectful silence for a deep family sorrow I should have been glad to share, but we are called on for more. The nation has ample ground for sadness as it sees its blood and treasure poured out without any choice given it, or any choice given its soldiers, in a war forced on it by the insubordination of Sir Bartle Frere. It has ample cause for sadness in the moral weakness which keeps it from acknowledging and repairing its wrong. The death of one voluntary participator in that wrong may well leave it unmoved. It should be more moved by the death of any of those whom it is unjustly attacking.

I omit all other considerations, all the social and national interests involved. I content myself with challenging the moral verdict of the nation on this death, which I fearlessly say should carry no honour, nothing but average human sympathy.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

17, MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, W.C.
6 *Charlemagne*, 91 (23 *June*, 1879).

BURMAH.

It is but too probable, looking at the general policy of our Indian Government, and the aims and character of the two public men with whom at present its direction rests, Lords Salisbury and Lytton ; looking also at all the professions of the supreme Government as a whole ; that had it not been for this unjustifiable Afghan war, we should have been by this time engaged in an attack on Burmah. Such an attack would have had for its real, if not avowed, object, the annexation of that kingdom to our Indian Empire.

It is against any such action that I wish to speak. If adjourned now, it is likely to be resumed when circumstances favour. Whatever the demerits of the King of Burmah, they are beside the question. A war upon him could be but a war of aggression, not of self-defence, even if we limit the term to our Indian possessions. It would be, in fact, the consummation of Lord Dalhousie's iniquitous spoliation of Burmah, which has never, I believe, been sanctioned by any diplomatic consent of the Burmese Government. The result of our wrong-doing has been a permanent and legitimate ill-feeling towards us on the part of that Government, an ill-feeling which must render any of the ordinary diplomatic intercourse undesirable, and the presence of a British Resident an irritation. The Indian Government has wisely withdrawn its representative, and would do well to abandon all wish for his return under existing circumstances, till in fact its own character and attitude have completely changed, and the danger of degradation which is attendant on the presence of such Residents shall have passed away. A standing risk of collision would thus be removed.

But more should be done. I hesitate not to say—and I speak not for myself alone;—in the name of a purer human morality, now brought to bear on the relations of all states

equally, that our Government should undo Lord Dalhousie's act, retrace its steps, and restore to Burmah all of which it was stripped by an act of naked robbery in 1852. England has much to do in the way of reparation, but there are few cases in which reparation is so called for as it is towards Burmah, few, I may add, in which it is at once so natural and so easy. There can be no compulsion in this case. Let England, then, do what is her obvious duty, restore an unrighteous gain. It were a nobler task than seeking to extend her unwieldy and oppressive dominion.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

17, MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, W.C.

7 *Descartes*, 91 (14 October, 1879).

THE EASTERN QUESTION.

The gravity of the present state of affairs cannot be denied. The personal and impulsive policy of our Government is leading us no one knows whither, for objects wholly incommensurate with the dangers attaching to their pursuit. As the country is in its hands it becomes the duty of those who strongly dissent from its action to speak plainly. In the limits of this paper we can but submit certain conclusions for consideration.

I. The Naval Demonstration in the Adriatic was an unstatesmanlike project, and its just failure, however unpleasant to its authors, should be accepted by the nation. We should be glad that we are so cheaply out of a coalition, formed on a misconception of the true European order, and in entire disregard of all the natural feelings of the power which it was sought to influence. It is plain that any wholesome moral pressure of Europe upon Turkey demands, as its first condition, the non-introduction of Russia.

In calling for the abandonment of this demonstration the Sultan of Turkey makes an essentially reasonable demand. That demonstration was in itself an insult which had nothing but mere force behind it, and the ulterior consequences of the precedent it would have established were easily discernible and are now openly avowed.

II. A war on behalf of Greece—a war to enlarge her dominions at the expense of another power—a war undertaken to uphold a decision against which that other power from the very beginning protested—with such a war we ought to have nothing to do. There is no conceivable justification for the increased demand on Turkey, which is the result of the Berlin Conference—a demand which is tending to fix such a war upon us.

III.—The maintenance of peace is the want of Europe. The unstable order which alone is attainable can only be upheld by a firm determination on the part of the greater powers to limit war to its strictly defensive function ; that function being the resistance to any oppression of one independent member of the whole system by another. If war is to be made in the interest of good internal government, where is the process to stop ? In the relations of nations as in the relations of classes violence has ceased to be justifiable, but least of all is it tolerable when exerted by a foreign power on behalf either of the government or subjects of another sovereign state.

Equally then, as Englishmen, and as Western Europeans, we object to the action of Mr. Gladstone's Government in relation to this difficult Eastern Question. Without adequate motive, without justice in its demand, with no evidence of a well-reasoned and prescient statesmanship, it offers us untold possibilities of danger, with scarcely a single compensation. The guidance to which our country has intrusted itself seems to us in the highest degree incompetent and dangerous, and as so judging, we do what we can to call forth the resolute opposition of our fellow citizens.

In the name of my co-religionists,

RICHARD CONGREVE.

17, MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, W.C.

2 *Descartes*, 92 (8 October, 1880).

THE TRANSVAAL.

'A rising in the Transvaal has recently imposed upon me the duty of taking military measures with a view to the prompt vindication of my authority, and has of necessity set aside for the time any plan for securing to the European settlers that full control over their own local affairs without prejudice to the interest of the natives which I had been desirous to confer.'—*Extract from the Queen's Speech of Thursday, January 6th, 1881.*

So speak our Ministers through the Queen.

More than one of the chief of those Ministers—some of their subordinates—have condemned the annexation of the Transvaal. Yet if they mean anything, they mean to crush by war the independence, the withdrawal of which they have openly reprehended.

And this in the name of duty. What imposes the duty? Can it be a duty to persist in an act which is in itself incapable of defence—and there is a general feeling, which those who have studied the subject know to be well grounded, that the annexation of the Transvaal is indefensible, that there we are clearly and wholly wrong.

What then, I repeat, imposes the duty? Our national pride and obstinacy. We have not the courage to retire from a position which is morally untenable—to reverse an acknowledged injustice—acknowledged, I mean, to be definite, by some at least of the Ministers who are sanctioning its maintenance and generally by those even who support their action.

A war conducted against a free people—whom for our purposes we unblushingly call rebels—to whose freedom we stood pledged—from whom we took their freedom quite unnecessarily—for certain evils and dangers attendant on it

might have been otherwise remedied—for such a war there is no justification. The blood shed in such a war must stand to the account of the Ministry which sanctions it, in such glaring contrast with all their professions.

In the name of Humanity we raise our voice against any reconquest of the Transvaal—we demand its restoration as a free State.

Signed on behalf of my co-religionists,

RICHARD CONGREVE.

17, MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, W.C.

7 *Moses*, 93 (7 January, 1881).

NOTE.—It is now some time since the Transvaal was seized by the criminal act of Sir Theophilus Shepstone. In the beginning of 1879 we protested against it. Has there been any thing done during the two years or more since its seizure to manifest the desire which the Queen is made to feel. Is it a desire which has been expressed and in any way acted on, for if not, its expression now is but a sorry device to colour our odious exertion of force—a latent desire is of no value. This is a point on which we need information.

THE IRISH CRISIS.

Those, and I am one of them, who from the first and unhesitatingly condemned the Irish Coercion Act on many grounds, are not likely to accept its latest applications. Unworthy of the government of a free people, oppressive and irritating to Ireland, fatal to the conciliatory measures which were to follow, lastly, unnecessary, for the ordinary forms of government were sufficient to deal with crime or mere disorder, they judged it in principle bad, a discreditable continuation of a policy which has been often tried and always with a mere passing success, and they saw the dangerous consequences with which it was fraught.

We have now those consequences brought out. If the Act is somewhat strained beyond what was avowed as its purpose; if it was put forward as necessary to deal with crime and open disorder and is used to stifle the voice of political opponents; we may dislike such use of the power it gave, but we can see that it is not an illogical outcome of the original vice of its nature.

What have been the stages in this contest? First, an indictment which failed; then the Coercion Act with its long train of irritating incidents; then, when all chance of a favourable judgment had been indefinitely lessened, a boon is offered in the shape of the Land Bill. On its non-acceptance we have what is practically a state of siege, a terror to enforce its acceptance, justified to its authors by their conviction that the Irish people is with them and only hindered from welcoming their proposal by a few leaders whom they accordingly sweep from their path. What if this be an error; what if the government has been blind to facts?

Why is the Land Bill unacceptable? First, because it has the character of a bribe—its advocates are not slow to

admit it,—a bribe to the Irish nation to barter for certain material benefits their proper object, their higher and just claims to be an independent state. I confront the two antagonist demands as tersely as possible. Independence of the English Parliament is the one condition, Mr. Parnell avows it, of a satisfactory settlement; dependence on the English Parliament is the one condition on which Mr. Gladstone insists as beyond concession, beyond even discussion, unless I mistake him greatly. The English statesman is no doubt in accordance with actual English opinion; the Irish statesman, with greater prescience and a more sympathetic insight into the true issue, has, in my conviction, the future with him. So long as the rulers of England hold to this curt arrogant denial of a nation's fair claim—it would seem they think it treason to assert it—so long peace is not possible; so long all that is attainable is an alternation of lulls and outbreaks, each successive crisis making the difficulty greater.

But this Land Bill is unacceptable on a second, if nearly allied, ground. It tends, as the Irish leaders see, to fasten more securely on them that from which they would be free, what is called landlordism, which constitutes the main difficulty of their struggle, as it is the real strength of the connection between the two countries. In other words, it is in their judgment a wholly inadequate measure, though sufficiently in advance of the present state to hold out a great temptation. They would have done with half-solutions.

Their action is not legal. No revolution is legal. Neither William of Orange nor Washington were in the strict path of legality; and a revolution tending to separation, such is the Irish movement under all its various phases—O'Connell—Fenianism—the Land League.

This English statesmen cannot or will not understand. So two incompatible nations remain bound together by virtue of the superior strength of one. Their conflicting claims do not become more but less reconcilable as the generations succeed one another. How long will the stronger persist in its claim? and persist in it as beyond argument: for in this lies the sting.

The counter-claim, whether advanced in Ireland, America,

or England, will not be listened to at present, and it is but too probable that the present as the former efforts of the Irish people will fail. Yet the conditions are changing, and much in the language used shows that this change is making itself felt.

The immediate future is very dark. Mr. Gladstone's haughty language betrays his consciousness of full support; he does not even avoid unnecessary irritation. No utterance could be less politic nor less generous than that at Guildhall; and the spell which his portentous word-power throws over the nation may induce it to follow him on his very questionable course, a course which has the further recommendation of conformity to the 'intensity of race antagonism, and the impatience of opposition.' We may see Ireland cowed and sullen—resistance by force its leaders have throughout deprecated; we may see a large amount of acquiescence in this Land Bill; we may see the consequent adjournment of the ulterior difficulty. The Ministry may triumph—for the time that is—but as in other cases a more or less distant posterity will sanction the reversal of the policy now in the ascendant. To its verdict I confidently appeal on the sure ground of historical experience.

'Force is no remedy,' said Mr. Bright. 'The use of force alone is but *temporary*,' said Burke: 'It may subdue for a moment, but it does not remove the necessity of subduing again, and a nation is not governed which is perpetually to be conquered.'

I would that the English people would awake not merely to a wiser policy, but to a higher morality and the conduct which should be its expression, refusing to be the instrument of a nation's servitude, to hold any people to us against its will. To put this issue before them, so far as I can, is the object of these few remarks, to be expanded later. A deliberate and well-matured concession of full independence to Ireland is the settlement for which I plead.

And I do not stand alone. As before, so now, what I say may be taken as the manifesto of a certain collective opinion, the opinion of both men and women—English men and women I would add. Were other proof wanting, the letters of Mr. Crompton and Mr. Beesly, which I have seen since

writing the above, warrant me in saying, that if small in number, and it is larger than appearances seem to allow, there is a determined body bent on a totally different treatment of Ireland from that hitherto adopted, bent on a full recognition of her claims in the fullest extent, the temperate but thorough discussion of which will be continued with the persistence which a religious conviction naturally secures. Our rulers must learn that no imputation of treason will silence those who hold that even such dismemberment of our Empire as would sever Ireland from it is a legitimate object for true English citizens to pursue.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

84, PALACE GARDENS TERRACE.

12 *Descartes*, 93 (19 October, 1881).

THE FATE OF ARABI.

The fate of war has placed Arabi—not to speak of the other Egyptian leaders—in the power of the English Government. Its nominee, supported by the bayonets of England, cannot take on him its responsibility in this matter, or that of the nation which it represents.

The brute element in England, through such organs as the *Spectator* newspaper and Sir Samuel Baker, is crying out for severity—for the death of Arabi. It is time then for those to speak who recoil from such a course with the loathing they think it should inspire in all noble minds.

We enter into no discussion of the merits of the question as between England and Egypt. Sufficient here if we say that to put to death—it makes no difference whether ourselves or through our instrument the Khedive—an important political opponent, a general who has met us in fair fight, and who is at any rate no rebel to us, no subject of England, were an action which we believe all honourable minds in all nations, western or eastern, would agree with us in branding as in the highest degree base.

The wise, the right thing in our judgment, is to accord to Arabi fallen the honourable exile we proposed for him when strong. Any other treatment we hold to be an unworthy use of our victory.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

LIVERPOOL.

11 *Shakespeare*, 94 (20 September, 1882).

POSITIVIST PROTEST AGAINST THE WAR IN
THE SOUDAN.

A Government of uncertain purpose and half-convictions, yielding to pressure and driven on by its own errors and misdeeds, has determined to continue the war in the Soudan, a war entered upon in order to rescue General Gordon and naturally ceasing with his death. It is making itself the instrument of a policy which it had hitherto disclaimed—a policy of vengeance, prestige, and aggrandisement.

The upper class Press and the society which it represents and stimulates call loudly for such policy, from mixed motives—commercial, bondholding and imperial—veiled under the specious and convenient formula of *civilisation* versus *barbarism*.

The nation generally is silent. Here and there, as by Mr. John Morley and Mr. Courtney, strong dissent is expressed, and I am glad to think that their expression is gradually gaining support, but there is as yet no concert of resistance to the course proposed. The general silence may mean assent—but it may not. We have experience to the contrary.

The State Church, through its official representative, the Archbishop of Canterbury with the agreement of his Suffragan Bishops, is forward with its sanction. It is difficult to command one's language in regard to its action. For the prayer in which it accords that sanction I and others feel an unqualified abhorrence. So much I may say.

This whole Egyptian business has been judged over and over again. It is useless to repeat what has been said. But when, as now, some new evil springs up it becomes a duty to speak, for each in his degree may aid.

In a just cause we accept war, but we see no justice in the cause in which we are engaged; from its root upwards it

has no good in it. In its principle and in all its sickening details the war is repugnant to us. The objects of the war, its avowed and unavowed objects, are also repugnant.

Therefore, it is that in the name of Humanity, I, and I speak for my co-religionists, protest against the decision of the Government, not merely as pregnant with evil consequences to our material and moral interests as a nation, but as in itself essentially and radically immoral—a pure abuse of our strength.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

55, PALACE GARDENS TERRACE, W.

20 *Homer*, 97 (17 February, 1885).

EASTERN EUROPE AND BULGARIA.

The Settlement effected at Berlin in July, 1878, whilst recognising the suzerainty of Turkey over Bulgaria, practically accorded an independent existence to the latter State. The arrangements then made have been disturbed by the revolution in Eastern Roumelia which led to its union with Bulgaria, and consequently to a change in the relations of Bulgaria with both Turkey and Russia. Hence it is that after ten years there is again great tension in Eastern Europe and danger of war. For the claims and objects of Russia conflict with the claims and objects of other great powers—her cosignatories to the Treaty of Berlin—most prominently with those of Austro-Hungary; but England and Italy, and, through Austro-Hungary, Germany are interested. In reality the difference touches all the Western Powers, as it threatens the general peace of Europe, so laboriously secured for a time by the above-mentioned Treaty.

Over and above this great object, viz., the securing of peace, the European statesmen who met in conference in 1878 aimed at affording the subject populations of Turkey in Europe a better and freer existence, with the hope of further growth towards complete national life. This was to be attained by giving them for the time as much autonomy as was practicable with the retention of the *status quo*. A Balkan confederation in more direct relation with Austria as the Eastern Representative of Western Europe—such seems to have been the general conception underneath the formal statement.

The contention of Russia is, on the contrary, that she is the power with whom, and with whom alone, the direct relation should exist, and the relation is to be one of entire

vassality. This seems the kernel of the question in its present stage. The issue is in fact: which shall predominate in South-Eastern Europe—the West, or the great Eastern, semi-European Empire. Below this lies the further question: shall the smaller states on or south of the Danube be states in their own right or the instruments of Russia for the present, of some other state possibly later on. And such contradictory conceptions evidently may at any moment, and on the slightest occasion, lead to war.

Were Western Europe united, were there a real European concert, there would be no Eastern difficulty before us. But in the absence of all real union the difficulty is there, and each separate state has to look most closely to its own action. Thus it is that for all English citizens it is a grave consideration: What is the duty of England in regard to this new complication, a complication again hinging specially on Bulgaria?

The immediate past of England has sadly added to the embarrassments of such a question. Her claims at Berlin—her retention of Cyprus—her consequent abandonment of Tunis to France, so extending the Mediterranean complications—later on her criminal and ill-starred Egyptian war—all these weigh heavily upon her actual government. Dislike and suspicion have been aroused or strengthened. Nor is the recent language of her leading Minister reassuring to those who wish a more unselfish attitude taken for the future. Her interests we are in substance told are her highest law. Still no errors, no unwise self-assertion can remove the necessity of a present decision, as no regret on our part can free us from the obligation of examining the various courses open to our country. Such an examination, however brief, should be conducted in one spirit only. In obedience to our Positivist principles, in accordance with the new policy inaugurated thirty years since by the pamphlet *Gibraltar*, I cannot insist on the separate national interest of England, I can only dwell on her duty.

What are the alternatives for England in regard to Eastern Europe? First, we may retire from all interference. We have at present certain obligations as having signed a given treaty, we cannot therefore say that we have no concern

with the matter. But we can say that on reconsideration we withdraw our signature and choose complete abstention. States, as individuals, must be competent to change their determination. All that seems imperative is the open avowal of the change of purpose. The leading powers of Eastern Europe would, in this case, so far as we are concerned, be left to settle their difficulties by themselves. In our peculiar position, on a careful survey of the complexities in which we are involved, as also on a well-weighed estimate of the other powers co-engaged with us, there is much to be said in favour of such a complete withdrawal. It would bind us, were it our choice, I cannot but think, morally to much from which the nation would recoil, but in itself and apart from ulterior considerations it has much to recommend it. This may be allowed, if on the whole we reject it.

There is the other alternative: to uphold our signature and stand by the existing treaty—always with this limitation that there is on the part of others who were associated with us in the act a like resolution to maintain it. It is implied that the others are in sufficient number or with sufficient power. More than this cannot be required of us. And this appears to be the conclusion of our present as well as our late government. We may observe with pleasure the wholesome return to the better tradition in regard to foreign policy so disastrously broken through in 1876, I mean to the tradition of the combined action of both parliamentary parties, which means that the national policy towards other states should be considered as outside the range of party questions, so that its unity may be unbroken despite any changes in the general party administration. In default of such accord England cannot have her legitimate weight in the councils of Europe. This by the way. If to adopt this second alternative is really the decision of the English government, it is a decision which, so far as we have any influence, singly or as a body, we should in my judgment support, and support in its practical consequences, not merely in principle, even if, to be quite plain, these consequences involve war.

For the weight of reason is against our withdrawal and in favour of acting on our engagements. Our past binds us—

the responsibility attaching to great strength binds us, for whatever our present difficulties, there is a great, a recognised strength in England—the uncertainties of the future even bind us. I mean that we might abandon our just place to day, and we might wish or be compelled to-morrow to resume it, to re-enter the concert which we had sought to quit; and the resumption of an abandoned position is more difficult than to keep it. Be this as it may, as a leading European state we have a duty on us, the social duty, not to weaken such common action as is desirable and attainable—not to shrink from the part which naturally falls to us.

No hostility to Russia—no exaggeration of her power or designs—no fear of her need be uppermost. In a word, we need not think of our policy in direct reference to Russia. The settlement made, the obligations incurred, the validity of formal engagements till they are set aside by new ones, these considerations are sufficient. It is our policy to take such steps as are essential to the peace of Europe, to the general maintenance of order. European peace and order can only be upheld by the maintenance of order within Western Europe, in the proper sense of the term, and a collision in Eastern Europe renders such maintenance well nigh impossible.

There is further, the due consideration of the newly created state which is the stake in the game. England was a party to its creation as an 'autonomous tributary state.' She has, therefore, an obligation not to throw it over. It might, it is true, be with her as with Germany, that a higher political necessity over-ruled our sympathy with Bulgaria, and we might have to abandon it. But it is not so as yet. We have the power to act and we may give its due weight to our feeling for a smaller state struggling into full national existence. Our position in no way forbids us. Nor is it a question of mere feeling for Bulgaria. On grounds of general policy no less than on grounds of partial interest she has claims on our attention. Permanent peace in Europe is of primary importance. The establishment and guaranteed existence of smaller free states whose welfare depends on peace, whose independence is only secure through peace, is

or should be an aim of European statesmen, for each such smaller state would naturally co-operate towards the primary object.

Undoubtedly the present trial of European statesmanship is great. The equilibrium is so unstable, the tension so extreme, that an impatient spirit might welcome some violent outbreak as promising some temporary relief and opening indefinite chances. But impatience is not the temper of rulers. For generations, I had almost said for centuries, the efforts of the wiser leaders of Europe have been limited to the arduous, most oppressive, but most honourable task of controlling disorder—to the preservation of the imperfect order they had received. It is but too much to be feared that it will long continue so. Time after time the effort has failed. Disappointments, however, cannot be pleaded in favour of slackening effort. Statesmen cannot abdicate, they must take up the burden of their predecessors. The labour is great, the result unsatisfactory as being provisional and of a patchwork character. It must be patchwork pending a greater change than lies within the competence of statesmen proper; a change, however, which depends much for its easier or harder attainment on their firmness and wisdom. As each new danger arises it has to be warded off, a new action has to be set on foot. They work in the midst of a revolution which they cannot stay, but their work is not the less honourable because it is so insecure.

This Eastern question has long been recognised as a danger. It might cease to be one or lose much of its gravity were it once understood that without any satisfactory union, yet in sufficient force, Western Europe insists on its peaceful unravelling and is prepared to make its insistence good. A clear determination to this effect, even under the actual unfavourable conditions, would in all probability ensure peace.

The issue is a well-defined one. It is not the aggrandisement of any power that is the object, but the gratification of the real permanent demand of the world, which is peace. And peace is demanded, not merely for its immediate blessings, but from the instinct that it is the necessary condition for working out the many difficult problems which,

far more than any merely international complications, concern the well-being of mankind. This may be said without underrating the extreme gravity of the international disturbances, which cry aloud for a truly constructive, organic statesmanship.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

55, PALACE GARDENS TERRACE, W
18 *Moses*, 99 (18 *January*, 1887)

MR. PARNELL'S POSITION.

I.

Purely human morality—positive morality—no other is here invoked—allows no hesitation as to the judgment in this case. The more human such morality is the more social is it, and the more therefore does it insist on the sacredness of the marriage relation, the more interested is it in protecting marriage as a creation of Humanity, who has by slow steps raised it from its lower forms to what it is actually, and who is still engaged in raising it till it become the strictest, completest monogamy, attaining a higher purity than it has hitherto reached. Under this aspect of the question it is evident that there has been a wrong act, and the penalty of the wrong doing must be borne by the doer.

Again, as to the manner of the action, the whole circumstances of the case, the moral judgment of Positivism is outspoken; it follows from its insistence on the duty and wisdom of living openly; evasions, deceptions, concealments are repugnant to it. The discredit attaching to these incidental accompaniments must therefore also be borne. To a proud, reticent, self-contained nature—and with such Mr. Parnell is generally credited—there usually attaches a high degree of sensitiveness, so that the punishment will not be a light one, the punishment which on both these counts he will have to meet.

The judgment so far is clear, the judgment on the act. The degree of leniency which as men we must introduce into our estimate of the agent will depend on our experience—our knowledge of the facts of life, of the world as it is, and on our own self-knowledge. What extenuation the case admits of

can be thoroughly known only to the parties immediately concerned. We can easily conceive there may be much to be urged in extenuation. In any case we shall judge as little as we can.

There remains, however, quite a distinct question. The cry is loud for more punishment. Under all kinds of impulses, impulses derived from all kinds of sources, pure and impure, the demand is made that the penalty of the acknowledged misconduct shall be dismissal from public life, or its real equivalent, the dismissal of Mr. Parnell from the leadership in the Irish cause.

What on this point is the verdict of the higher morality which the Religion of Humanity asserts and wishes to substitute for the more uncertain, less surely grounded, morality of theologism? Shall it on this as on the former points assent, if for rather different reasons, to the conclusions we see generally accepted by the disciples of the older system, as for instance in the manifesto of the Roman Catholic Episcopate in Ireland, a document not without interest, as it will test the strength of their hold on the practical direction of their country. The answer as to the decision of the New Faith is given by the essential character of Positive morality. It is social in its whole character, and in all its aims. Therefore, whilst it in no way condones the wrong doing, it cannot accept the conclusion that misconduct should be a final bar to action; that it should close an existence which can be used. Rather does it see in the use of such existence, in its full employment in the service of society, the real reparation for the injury inflicted. It goes farther, it even uses the previous evil as a source of good—as an incentive to greater exertion. It seeks, that is, to elicit from the consciousness of past wrong a strengthening of the moral fibre for the work which has yet to be done. In short, it judges the demand which we are considering to be the demand of feebleness, equally irrational and unsocial.

Without any comment on the whole or any other part of a social scheme which is the object of much attention and discussion just now—a scheme in which theology is being inspired with social purpose—I take one point in it as an illustration of my meaning. I take a principle which is

prominent in it, and against which I have heard no objection raised, which may be taken as accepted in a sphere where it does not touch party feelings or interests. I allude to the principle that no life, however stained and vicious, is therefore to be abandoned, to be considered as shut out—not from repentance and amendment personally, that is quite a different issue—but from good work—from mixing with and aiding others, nay even from directing others. I take this, I say, as an illustration, and so far as it goes, a support of the conclusion of a non-theological morality, which would consign no one to the cloister or inaction, but extract from all whatever they can give.

On purely moral grounds then it is here maintained that Mr. Parnell should hold on—should continue the work he has been doing in the service of his nation. He has placed Ireland in a new position; he has the power yet to aid in carrying her still further onwards towards her full national existence. His personal delinquency must not break off his effort; it should act in quite the opposite direction; it should raise it and intensify it. In the service of his country let him atone for his past. His task has never been an easy one; it has not led him into pleasant places. Throughout the sixteen years of his Parliamentary life he has had to face constant annoyance, insult, and hostility. He has the prospect of a worse time—the prospect of opposition embittered, as he must feel, by his own act; and he has the additional bitterness to bear that he has damaged his country's cause. But all this does not constitute a reason, the reverse rather, for his withdrawal.

It is this moral question which has the main interest for me, as being of the higher, more permanent importance, from its relation to all the conduct of life. It concerns all those who see much to regret or even to be remorseful for in the years behind us—and this is, at any rate, no uncommon case—it concerns all of us to see aright the obligation herein laid upon us, to feel the stimulus hence derivable for our actual and our future endeavour—in a word, judging rightly of the course to be pursued, to make reparation by increased exertion.

II.

But it cannot be denied that there is also great interest, if of a more transient kind, in the political issues involved in this tangled debate which every hour complicates into worse confusion. It will clear with time, but meanwhile it behoves one to speak with caution. I shall do so shortly, avoiding all attempt to forcast the immediate result.

Over and above the political there is also a strong, exciting personal interest in the courage and skill with which the Irish leader confronts his opponents. He justifies their past confidence by the great qualities he evinces, justifies equally those who continue that confidence, amply vindicates in fine his effort to remain what he has been—his nation's chief. His strength in this emergency explains the trust it has placed in him.

Retirement from the leadership is urged on Mr. Parnell for many different reasons. Such retirement is meant, I presume, by most to be final. I find it difficult to understand what a temporary withdrawal would mean. It would be, without any compensation, an injurious interruption to the continuous action which is so desirable in politics. I assume then that it is the definitive abdication of the leadership of his nation which is pressed upon him.

It is urged as a concession to English feeling, a measure of conciliation. Not in itself a strong reason, this must be singularly without force to Mr. Parnell. Has English feeling any claim upon him? Has it been so favourable to him, or on the whole so moderately just even towards him that he should take it into account? Is it in itself, with all its inconsistencies and fluctuations and narrowness, an object of much respect? He has been strong by setting it at nought, why should he now bow before it?

Again, it is urged in the interest of the Liberal party, which requires the continuance of Mr. Gladstone's guidance. Mr. Parnell must have seen that party close enough to enable him to estimate it aright as of very slight value, a nerveless thing. And in reference to the English Liberal leader he has

strong warrant for his judgment that of the two Mr. Gladstone should be the one to go. He has, it is now clear, tested his competitor, formed a very definite estimate of his political value, and on that estimate casts from him, once and for all, every chance of personal co-operation. There is an irreconcilable difference always between the man of action and the man of words.

It is urged lastly in the interest of Ireland, as in the interest also of the party which he has formed and led, the party which is the expression of the will of that portion of Ireland which he represents. On this point I am quite aware that the ultimate settlement must rest with him and his party, and finally with that for which they both act, their constituencies. Still it offers much matter for attentive consideration.

Standing aloof from all political parties, whilst deeply interested in Ireland and its sad destiny, I see no force then in any of the reasons assigned except the last. I see no force in the demand for the conciliation of English feeling, nor in the alleged necessity of retaining Mr. Gladstone, nor in the upholding any English party. Passing to the interest of Ireland which is the supreme issue, that rightly estimated does not seem to me to make for the termination of Mr. Parnell's leadership. Not that I am a follower of Mr. Parnell in his policy for Ireland. I am no Home Ruler, therefore no follower of the leaders who put forward Home Rule, whether as a final settlement or as a step towards entire separation. I consider what is offered under that term if attained to be fraught with danger—the danger of a profitless friction between the two countries,—or supposing such friction avoided, the danger of injuring Ireland by institutions alien to her true interests, by the infliction on her of a parliamentary system which she might avoid. It is to separation that I adhere as to the only satisfactory issue of the great controversy, and which would be equally the only satisfactory issue had there been no controversy. I would restore to Ireland her full national existence; constitute her a state among equal states—a sister—I will not say kingdom—but sister state, under whatever form she adopt. I would have this complete and final independence to be the clearly designed and openly avowed aim of all English policy in reference to

Ireland, an ultimate aim to be gradually and peacefully attained by such wise preparatory measures as it ought to be within the competence of the statesmen of both countries to devise. I deprecate consequently the unsatisfactory transition which the Home Ruler accepts. It would be wiser in my judgment to wait for the inevitable hour when the full solution shall be attainable, than to lower the claims of Ireland from impatience, and to carry through some half-measure doomed to be an obstacle, as half-measures but too generally are, to the complete achievement.

Allowing for this difference, I yet advocate the retention of Mr. Parnell as leader, without any break in his tenure of the post. A statesman of a higher order—more sagacious, more prescient than his English contemporaries, though by the very conditions of his particular task he has been more limited as to the field for his capacity—he is amply justified in setting aside their counsels and holding on on his independent course. This they appear from their recent utterances largely to allow. Neither from the point of view of England's assistance, nor from that of Ireland's needs, should he retire.

For the latter, it is the confession of his bitterest opponents—Irish now, English in the past time—that Ireland has had no such leader—I speak of the statesman. He has formed a compact body; he has made it of decisive weight in the contests of our wretched party government; he has kept it in complete independence, with the most audacious yet most politic disregard of the influences which have been brought against it—influences traceable to the interests of English political parties; he has gained Ireland's confidence in himself, he has given her confidence in herself. He has acquired by years of daring patience a great influence, and I doubt not a great insight. He has secured for Ireland a great influence. Perseverance in the same methods and under the same conduct would seem the natural dictate. To put such a leader away and to put his leadership in commission, would be on all true political reasoning a disastrous blunder. The decision, however, as before said, must rest with Ireland, hardly with her representatives. On such a vital question the appeal lies to the nation in both its

constituents—its home constituent and its colonial constituents.

For the first, for England, it is in the hope of England's help, in the reliance on the power of one of her parties, that the existing disunion of the Irish party seeks its justification. A review of past action, an estimate of the forces at present working within her, encourages no such hope. One party will not, the other cannot, give what Ireland wants, for it is not sufficiently supported to do so, even granting what I much doubt, its willingness really to satisfy the Irish demands. No; if Ireland's cause demands strength, patience, and a clear-sighted audacity, English opinion requires an infusion of much greater vigour than it possesses at present to give substance or effect to its increasing tendency towards a just reparation. They are sadly to seek who trust in it to the exclusion of a strong, proved, and concentrated leadership. The existence of a hard, audacious, knotty body within the English legislature, but outside England's proper existence—a body in strictest unity under a tried leader—offers the best security for her maturing into a decisive force the very feeble power which resides in her actual opinion. I do not question the improvement in that opinion, but it is yet far too weak to overbear the counter influences, nor is it much to be relied on in itself. Witness the implied menace to abandon the cause of Ireland if not gratified on a special point.

For both countries alike, what is wanted is to keep the issue unintermittingly before them and to keep it above the atmosphere of party, till such time as whatever there is of statesman-like wisdom in the two nations combine to solve the inherited difficulty, on the sole admissible principle that it is the true interest of Ireland—in no degree the interest of England—which is to direct the solution. The immediate guarantee for the Irish question being upheld at this level is, in my judgment, the permanence of Mr. Parnell's leadership. The Irish party should—we may hope will—dismiss all disunion, all hesitation, and return to the plan by which so much has been effected, and refuse to rest its existence on any English party or statesmen. The harder it makes itself of assimilation by English political life, the more sure it is of

attaining its true object—the autonomy of Ireland. Who can doubt that the man who conceived and has been the embodiment of this policy is the proper leader for continuing it?

A cause may and does move forward apart from any personality, but it is only a vague democratic feeling which would underrate the value of a strong personality when there is one to be found. But this democratic feeling operates very strongly. The weak outcry against a dictator is its expression. It is largely tainted with envy and ambition. It derives its strength from a long tradition of abuse of great leaders; of assertion of revolutionary doctrines. Its danger lies in the appeal to the nobler impulses to self-abnegation in those against whom it is directed. In the present instance nothing is so much to be dreaded as a compromise accepted as a consequence of such appeal. Strong personalities are unfortunately rare, and past and present are rife with examples of the evil consequences when a real leader has been set aside or disappeared. I can only hope that the decision of Ireland may afford no fresh confirmation of this experience.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

55. PALACE GARDENS TERRACE, W.

1 Bichat, 102 (December 3, 1890).

NATIVE INDIAN GOVERNMENT.

As an aid in forming our judgment on Indian questions and the policy to be adopted by the British rulers of India, I reprint a series of reasons in favour of Native Government—reasons given by an eminent native statesman.

They are taken from the *Hindu*, which had taken them from the *Bombay Gazette*.

I introduce them with no words of my own, but with some extracts from the *Indian Nation*, a paper published by a thoughtful and careful Indian gentleman, and with an account of their author given by the *Statesman* and endorsed by the Editor of the *Indian Nation*. They show who and what the author of the reasons was and the estimation he was held in both by Indian and English authorities.

I.

FROM THE *Indian Nation*.

In the person of Raja Sir T. Madhava Rao one of the greatest natives of India has passed away. We are not aware of any three of our countrymen, living or recently dead, who could be compared to him in point of general intellectual power and grasp and statesmanlike capacity. The *Statesman* is the only Indian journal which has so far given anything like a detailed account of his career, and we have taken the liberty to reproduce it in another column. But the man was very well known to his contemporaries independently of any biography. A liberal culture, practical statesmanship, and thorough independence were his distinguishing characteristics. His life is worth a study not merely as the record of a brilliant career but as a com-

mentary on British rule. Not British India but the Native States found a career for Sir T. Madhava Rao.

* * * *

The British Government gave a tardy recognition to Sir T. Madhava Rao by offering him a seat in the Legislative Council of India, but the honour had been delayed till he was old and could not enjoy it, till he was known and did not want it. He, therefore, declined it. Like other true statesmen he was thoroughly loyal to English rule and might well be called one of the Pillars of the Empire. Even the advice of such a man was disregarded by the Government on social legislation. Does the Government really know who is who? Sir T. Madhava Rao singly represented public opinion far more accurately than a hundred shrieking men who might have control of some newspaper. Upon all important questions of society and politics Sir T. Madhava Rao's latest opinions were the most mature, and they were perfectly consistent with his earlier opinions so far as we are aware of them. His intellectual vigour and range of information were alike large, his opinions sober. There is no prospect of his loss being repaired for a long time to come.

II.

FROM THE *Statesman*.

The death of Raja Sir Tanjore Madhava Rao, K.C.S.I., announced to us last evening by wire from Madras, removes one of the most prominent figures from the ranks of Hindoo society. Although not quite unexpected for some time past, the news will be received with feelings of regret and sorrow by the people in all parts of India, among whom the deceased enjoyed the reputation of being, with one exception, the ablest Native statesman of the present generation. Madhava Rao was born in 1828, at Combaconum, in the Tanjore district of the Madras Presidency. A Brahmin by caste and a Mahratta by race, it would seem as if his rare capacity for statecraft had come down to him by inheritance, his father and his paternal uncle having successively held the office of Dewan at the Court of Travancore. In the year 1841, he

joined the High School at Madras, where he was regarded as one of the foremost pupils of Mr. Eyre Burton Powell, C.S.I., and in 1846 he obtained a diploma as a scholar of the highest class. Not long afterwards he was, as a rare mark of distinction, selected to fill temporarily the post of Mr. Powell himself, as Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy in the Madras High School. From school he passed into the local Accountant-General's Office where, after two years' service, from 1847 to 1849, during which his exceptional abilities were recognised, he was preferred to the appointment of preceptor to the nephews of the Raja of Travancore. He discharged his duties in this capacity with so much ability and success that in July, 1853, he was advanced to the still more important office of the Dewan Peshkar, or Assistant Prime Minister of the State. During the time he filled the second post in the Travancore Administration, he won the highest respect, not only from the Raja himself, but from all classes of the Raja's subjects, for integrity, energy, and impartiality; and Lord Harris, then Governor of Madras, communicated to him an expression of his hope that 'great results' might follow from his connection with the administration of the affairs of the Travancore State. It was therefore that Mr. J. B. Norton, a Member of the Madras Legislative Council, spoke of him with absolute truth as 'a splendid example of what education may do for the native.' In the beginning of 1858 Madhava Rao became Dewan, and at once set about carrying out those great reforms which have established his claims to be regarded as an able and successful administrator. He greatly relieved the general trade of Travancore by reducing the high rates of export and import duties, and by removing other fiscal restrictions; while he completely revised the prevailing system of administering civil and criminal justice. He laid down a better plan of popular education; he increased the provision for the medical wants of the people; and he projected a liberal scale of public works with a scheme of communications such as was quite unknown out of British India. Although these improvements necessarily increased the expenditure of the State, his arrangements were so contrived that its income still showed a clear margin

of surplus. In April, 1866, Sir Madhava Rao was raised to the Knighthood of the Star of India. After a long and honourable service of fourteen years, he in May, 1872, resigned the Dewanship on a pension of Rs. 500 per month, secured to him by the Raja of Travancore. In a Parliamentary blue-book Sir Madhava's services are thus acknowledged:—'The State of Travancore in the extreme south of the Peninsula, with its revenue of half-a-million, is one of the best governed parts of India. And the whole administration is admirably conducted. Sir T. Madhava Rao, K.C.S.I., who has now resigned the office of Dewan of Travancore, was an able statesman; and the present prosperity of the State is due, in a great measure, to his judgment and integrity.' Sir Madhava Rao was offered a seat in the Viceregal Legislative Council by Lord Napier of Merchistoun and Ettrick, when acting Viceroy during the interregnum after Lord Mayo's death, but he declined the offer, although it was pressed upon him by the Governor of Madras. On the invitation of Maharaja Holkar, however, he, in February, 1873, accepted the office of Dewan at Indore, on the condition that he would hold it for only three years. Shortly after his arrival at Indore, Lord Northbrook wished him to go to England for the purpose of giving evidence in matters of Indian Finance before the Finance Committee of the House of Commons; but his services could not then be spared from Indore. Before, however, the expiry of the first term of his engagement, and after the deposition of Mulhar Rao Gaekwar, when the disorganised state of affairs in that State was completely disclosed to the knowledge of the Government of India, Lord Northbrook, with the consent of Maharaja Holkar, appointed Sir Madhava Rao to be Prime Minister of Baroda, where his services were quite as successful, on a larger scale, as they had years before been in Travancore. In little more than four years not only did he succeed in extricating the State from the condition of almost hopeless indebtedness in which he found it on assuming office, but he was able to deposit in the Bombay Treasury, to the credit of the Baroda State, the very large sum of eighty lakhs of rupees. The improvement he had effected in the finances, he had also carried out in all other departments of

the administration, and for his great services he received the title of Raja, on the occasion of the Queen's assumption of the title of 'Empress of India,' on the 1st of January, 1877. When, after completing the work he had been deputed to do, he resigned the Dewanship to enjoy his hard-earned rest, his resignation was reluctantly accepted and the occasion was taken to bestow on him substantial marks of the high value that the Government of India and the Gaekwar set on his services to the State of Baroda. With his voluntary retirement from public life, Sir Madhava Rao did not cease to take a keen and intelligent interest in public questions of importance. His active, intelligent and well-informed mind was always busy in the discussion of Indian social and political matters, on which he brought to bear his wide knowledge and ripe experience of public affairs. The papers of a 'Native Thinker' in the *Hindoo* of Madras, which deservedly attracted much attention at the time of their publication, were, it is well-known, from his pen. His complete mastery of the English language, the ease and fluency with which he expressed himself in it, and his familiarity with the best works in English literature were among his other merits. Nor must we forget what will conduce to his lasting honour, that while he heartily sympathised in all schemes of progress calculated to be of real benefit to his country, he always employed his deservedly great personal influence to restrain the advocates of reform from adopting any hasty or extravagant measures. His death at this critical time is a national loss to India; especially as, in the course of human nature, he might have been expected to render much public service for some years to come. We should not perhaps close this hasty notice without quoting what was said of him by an English politician who was admittedly a competent judge of administrative work. Speaking from his place in the House of Commons, the late Professor Fawcett said of him that 'Sir Madhava Rao administered Travancore with so much skill as justly to entitle him to be considered the Turgot of India. He found Travancore when he went there in 1849 in the lowest state of degradation. He has left it a model State. This is the kind of men for whom we have no proper

opening at a time when our resources are declared to be inelastic, and when, if the opium revenue failed, we should not know where to turn to for the amount required.

III.

REASONS FOR NATIVE INDIAN GOVERNMENT, GIVEN BY
SIR T. MADHAVA RAO. *Hindu* FROM *Bombay Gazette*.

1. The revenues are mostly spent in the country itself.
2. There is generally a considerable reserve in the Treasury so as to obviate chronic difficulty about the finances.
3. Public taxation is not liable to frequent alterations.
4. Public salaries are not liable to frequent reductions.
5. The salaries of the higher officials of Government are more liberal.
6. Men who have rendered good service and are capable of rendering more are not forced to retire merely because they have attained the age of 55 years.
7. Taxes are not levied with rigorous exactitude, but in a manner more suitable to the natives.
8. Remissions are granted with a freedom, frequency and liberality more suitable to the natives.
9. The ryots' lands are not so unsympathetically sold by auction for the payment of revenues.
10. On occasions of distress or difficulty advances are given to the ryots more sympathetically or more liberally.
11. The ryots are more sympathetically or more liberally assisted in the improvement of their properties.
12. The ryots are more sympathetically or more liberally assisted in the cultivation of waste lands.
13. The sinking of new wells is more effectually encouraged.
14. Minor works of irrigation are more attended to.
15. Newly reclaimed lands are not so microscopically scrutinised nor so rigorously assessed.
16. The cultivator's time and labours are not so much interfered with for judicial purposes or pretexts.
17. His goods are seldom so far distrained as to disable him from cultivation or to reduce him to the verge of starvation.

18. The sowcar who lends money to the ryots is not allowed to be so inordinately exacting.

19. The people are more simple and virtuous, therefore there is less litigation in the Courts and Cutcheries.

20. Grievances are not allowed to grow and strengthen. As soon as they are felt, a body of villagers or citizens (not affected) go up to the authorities and make personal representations, as there are no elaborate rules prohibiting such representations and prescribing particular channels or methods.

21. They need not proceed through a series of local and other authorities. Professional assistance is not necessary to draw up or present their petitions. Endorsements, reports, and other documents need not accompany the petitions. The petitions need not be stamped. Even the simplest oral representation is sure to receive attention as if from members of a family to its head. Subsequent procedure partakes of the same simplicity. The local officer chiefly concerned is sent for and made to explain matters in the presence of the aggrieved. Redress is granted without circumlocution or delay.

22. It is very seldom indeed that such a body of citizens or villagers is refused a personal hearing and dispersed by an armed police. So properly are the native authorities conciliatory that they have an insuperable objection to call in military aid on such occasions. They know that such an extreme step might draw down upon them the highest displeasure.

23. A body of citizens or villagers wishing to explain their grievances is not deterred by fear of the police, &c. Failing to obtain redress at the Cutcherry, they might go up to the Palace and put their case directly before the Maharaja himself. In these circumstances all authorities concerned are more anxious to prevent grievances arising than to let them arise and then defend themselves.

24. There being in accordance with ancient custom a greater centralization of authority, petitioners are not harassed by being successively referred to a series of separate and independent authorities such as Revenue, Police, Civil, Criminal, Public Works, Forest, &c. Petitioners in preferring their complaints, orally or in writing, are allowed a great deal

of freedom. They are seldom embarrassed by the fear of criminal prosecutions for defamation.

25. The native ruling authorities instinctively possess the invaluable advantage of knowing the character, life, and peculiarities of the native population and of the chief individuals among them, whereas it may take a lifetime for the European ruler to attain such advantages.

26. The subjects of native states enjoy immunity from the income and professional taxes, and from the vexations incident thereto.

27. They more frequently settle their differences among themselves, or by panchayats or by compromises.

28. The stimulants to unnecessary litigation are less numerous.

29. The decrees of the Court are generally more equitable and satisfactory to the people.

30. False evidence, oral or documentary, does not so much pervert justice.

31. Bribery has long prevailed in all parts of India, but it is diminishing everywhere, and I am sure examples of unimpeachable integrity exist in the higher ranks of the service in such states as Travancore, Mysore, Baroda, Cochin, Indore, &c.

32. The higher and more respectable classes of the people are treated with greater respect and consideration.

33. They are less liable to be dragged before Courts and Cutcheries and humiliated like common coolies.

34. They are less liable to be sentenced to labour along with thieves and dacoits.

35. They are less liable to be made the victims of false, malicious, or trivial complaints.

36. Factious or seditious combinations are not so easy.

37. Individuals who have been injured in person or property more cordially and more actively assist the police in detection.

38. Police and other officers are not so frequently changed or transferred as to prevent the accumulation of useful experience.

39. The police do not so much take cognisance of small or technical offences.

40. The laws are not so many, so complex, and so technical as to perplex the people and make them helpless.

41. The laws are not so frequently altered, modified, or added to.

42. The laws about salt, akbari, &c., are not so minute and vexatious.

43. The stamp laws are much less harassing.

44. The forest restrictions are not so rigorous or harassing to the people.

45. The jails are more considerably managed, because by natives who understand natives better than Europeans do.

46. Health and strength is not starved, as it may find a footing in the military service, as the discipline is not so rigid and so difficult.

47. The sons of honourable families might find employment in the army.

48. Meritorious service in any department is recognised or encouraged by making some provision for the descendants of the family concerned.

49. Widows and orphans of meritorious servants when poor and destitute are not left to starve, but have some compassionate provision made for them.

50. Extraordinarily good service is more tangibly or liberally rewarded.

51. The people are not so much educated out of their traditional ways.

52. So many competitive examinations to mechanically determine merit and often to miss the best of it, do not prevail.

53. Simple vernacular education is less superseded or less replaced by one of an alien language.

54. Ancient Sanskrit learning is more encouraged.

55. National music and other fine arts are more fostered or encouraged.

56. Scientific hobbies are less ridden.

57. Indigenous manufactures are more encouraged.

58. Trade is less infested with fraudulent practices.

59. Ancient charities are more efficiently maintained.

60. National temples are managed more to the satisfaction of the people.

61. The people are not so much disturbed in their ancient religious feelings and sentiments.

62. All classes of people better maintain their mutual traditional relations, and this minimises quarrels among them and better maintains peace.

63. People pursue their hereditary callings with less morbid ambitions.

64. The modes of earning and living are more stable and are not so liable to disturbance or intermingling.

65. The great bulk of the people respect and even revere their native ruler.

66. The people have easier access to the officers of Government, and even to the Maharaja himself, to make personal representations.

67. The people more participate in the festivities of their ruler.

68. The ruler more participates in the festivities of his people.

69. The native ruler has far more personal influence for good than Viceroys and Governors could have. It is an influence of vital importance in times of general trouble or difficulty.

70. Neither the ruler nor his officers are frequently exposed to public contempt by perverse criticism.

71. There is more opportunity for the natives of India to obtain and exercise real power and responsibility and to acquire distinction, which are almost impossible in British Indian territory.

72. Good Government in Native States may seem much less scientific, but it often produces more repose and more contentment so congenial to the people of India.

73. Altogether a well-governed Native State possesses a character of greater elasticity which suits natives of India better than the cast iron rigidity of a scientific and alien rule.

74. It is an undoubted fact that the people of the Native States are extremely averse to go under British rule, and would make many sacrifices to be continued under native rule, and this fact carries its own implication.

75. Good native rule assisted by wise and moderate

British Indian counsels is increasingly yielding the most desirable fruits, beneficial to all the parties concerned.

76. It would be a sad day for India if the Native States disappear and all India be levelled under the iron pressure of British rule, an effect which Gibbon deplored in the case of the Roman Empire.

These 76 reasons might easily be condensed and grouped under some few heads, such as Taxation, Administration, Legislation, Social and Religious Feeling, and the Relations between Government and Subjects, but I have preferred to leave them as they are given.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

55, PALACE GARDENS TERRACE, W.

15 *Frederic*, 103 (19 November, 1891).

LA REVUE OCCIDENTALE.

LIVE OPENLY.

I would shortly state why I abstain from all part in the above publication which calls itself *the* Positivist Organ. We may regret that there should be any difference of opinion amongst Positivists, but those which exist are open to discussion, and I see no reason to conceal my own divergence on this point of a Review. I have taken pains to state it with fitting moderation.

First, assuming for argument's sake that such an organ was desirable, I think the time badly chosen, and I feel at variance with the spirit which prompted its creation under our existing circumstances. We were in the midst of a crisis, and in my opinion it would have been wiser not to enter on a course calculated to embitter it. To allay the trouble and to act in the interest of the movement as a whole would have been a better course than to decide on the Review. But it was an useful weapon and was too much valued as such, and consequently it is rather an apple of discord than a means of combining the whole body.

At the last moment the decision was very brusque. There was but little consulting even of those most interested and those who were most relied on. The Review was decreed—if I may say so—as an urgent necessity. I cannot think that it was such, if I may trust to the documents I have, unless we put a very peculiar interpretation on the expression, urgent necessity. There had been a long delay, some weeks more would not have been thrown away on the discussion of an enterprise, which, after all, is dependent on the co-operation of the body.

I have gone over the whole history of the business as I remember it, recalled all the antecedents of the Review as now launched,—and I must say that it is distasteful to me, that I disapprove of it morally, and that I consider it as a serious evil in so far as concerns the union of the disciples of Auguste Comte.

I say nothing of the details. I am not concerned with them. But I have to treat the more important question of principle.

I confess not to clearly understand in what the *Revue Occidentale* of this year differs from the Review planned by Auguste Comte twenty-six years ago. (*Comp. the Preface to the Second Volume of the Politique Positive, to be found at page liii of the Fourth Volume.—E. Tr.*)¹ The reproduction of the official acts of the Direction of Positivism can hardly at present affect its character, and as to the rest, the two publications appear to me nearly identical as to their general object. The 29th Circular leaves me in considerable perplexity and hesitation. *An official journal of the Priesthood*—I question its utility. But allowing it to be a necessity, the *Revue Occidentale*, as set forth in the short circular of the 25th December, 1877 (the Positivist date is not given), is scarcely such a journal. After all has been said, surely the Review is an ordinary periodical, and as it is, in the idea of its founder, in the closest connection with the spiritual power, *official organ of the priesthood* (29th Circular, p. vi.), one may well hesitate before accepting it. I call particular attention to this close connection, as also to the permanent, unprovisional character of the publication.

Let me cite the judgment of Auguste Comte (*Pos. Pol.*, vol. iv., p. v., *E. Tr.*):—‘The obligation to speak at a given time and within given bounds becomes, it is true, less objectionable in proportion as the interval is longer, and yet a periodical judgment can never be applicable when that which is judged, the spectacle of human wants, is intermittent. Closing as it does the spiritual interregnum, Positive religion will naturally put an end to the power,

¹ I place the two statements side by side.

I.—That in the Fourth Volume :

The Occidental Review, or, Continuous application of Positivism to the natural course of human events, contemplated both in the past and the future with a view to the systematic appreciation of the intellectual and social movement of the five advanced populations, &c.

II.—That in the Circular of December, 1877. Each number is to contain :

1. Systematic appreciation of the political, social, and intellectual movement during the preceding two months.
2. A series of original works.
3. Reproduction of the official acts of the Direction of Positivism.

The differences are not in favour of the latter plan.

'which, owing to that interregnum, the literateurs of the West have usurped. Hence the priesthood of Humanity should deny itself all share in an institution which it will shortly have to condemn as radically anarchical, &c., &c.'

Again (*Vol. iv., p. 332*), 'opinion needs, as the experience of Catholicism shows, only one weekly discourse to direct it in connecting with the worship the application of the principles given by education. And the amount of periodical teaching which is enough for the normal state, is still more suited for the organic transition, when convictions ought above all to receive a new birth from solitary meditation, perpetually broken in upon by those who undertake to speak with no reason for speaking.'

Such considerations had led our Master to his "irrevocable renunciation of periodicals." They may surely suffice to justify one of his disciples in abstaining.

But little mixed up directly with the question of a Review in France, I have always set myself against any periodical organ in England. I adhered ultimately to the *Politique Positive*, strongly urging that it should be provisional. I regretted that, when once undertaken, it fell prematurely, but I made no effort towards its re-establishment; I was rather inclined to the opinion of M. Laffitte when he refused (I believe I am right in my date), in 86 (1874) distinctly and with some heat, if it were revived, to have any share whatever in it. I should in any case prefer non-periodical publications. But I should not absolutely refuse my adhesion to something simpler, of a provisional character, as far as possible detached from the direct action of the priesthood, though not without feeling its influence, and of such a form as to circulate freely and cheaply in the Positivist world to begin with, and thence penetrating the general public of the West. These conditions are not fulfilled by the present publication, as I see it.

I should be the last to deny that good results have followed from the part we have taken in periodical literature, but I hold that we ought to interfere but very occasionally, and with a careful avoidance of the literary attitude. The *Revue Occidentale* seems to me not at all to conform to these conditions by its form and mode of publication.

Be this as it may, I consider the main sphere of action for the believers in the new Religion to be elsewhere, and we should look well to it before we adopt the course now taken. I have great doubt as to whether the Review is a wise employment of our strength, and I fear, moreover, that it will have a bad influence on our younger members, by diverting them towards the expression of their opinions at an age when it should be their main object to form and mature their convictions.

All combines to make me think that, in reversing, in the degree in which it has been reversed, the formal decision of our Master, too great weight has been allowed to considerations of the moment ; too little to those which bear upon our future.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

LONDON: 17, MECKLENBURGH SQUARE.

16 St. Paul, 90 (5 June, 1878).

MY ANSWER TO DR. BRIDGES.

I begin with matters of fact, and with one which directly bears on my own action in the appointment of M. Laffitte.

I. (p. 3.) I did not recognise "the prior claims of one who was many years my junior!" I was ready, and Dr. Bridges knows the truth of what I say, I was ready to take the vacant place, had my colleagues been willing to accept me. I did not see any prior claims. I am, I believe, right in saying that of all who were concerned I was the only one who had spoken openly. "M. Congreve a fait ses épreuves" was M. Laffitte's own testimony. The publication of *Gibraltar* had broken ground in England, and had met with the full approbation of our common Master. I did not by a word press any claim however—and on the grounds elsewhere stated I promoted the nomination of M. Laffitte. If, since, I have never let the decision against me weigh on my action, if I have often felt thankful that I was not chosen, I have consistently objected to the reason on which it rested, to my exclusion on the score of nationality.

Incidentally there arises the question of age, on which some stress is apparently laid. So far as I can make out M. Laffitte is older by one year than Dr. Audiffrent, about the same age—I am doubtful whether older or younger—as Drs. Robinet and Foley,—(of Dr. Bazalgette I cannot speak)—and if my information is correct he is four years my junior. It is to me a wholly unimportant point: but if it is pressed accuracy is desirable.

II. (p. 6.) My memory is at issue with Dr. Bridges' as to the conclusion of M. Laffitte's addresses in London. It was with an estimate of the political forecast in England that, so far as I can recall the matter, he concluded. He wished our future might be, and I remember that his language was very touching, an evolution and not a revolution. I do not call

to mind any particular expression about our own body : but I had spoken at great fulness with him on its want of cohesion and my difficulties with it, and I quite agree with Dr. Bridges, that any exhortation to union might wisely have been laid to heart on many subsequent occasions.

III. (p. 6 notef.) Any one who will read my circular* will see that the statement that I accuse M. Laffitte of 'undue reticence when he does not' defend his action is scarcely warranted by it. What I do accuse him of is the not giving any account of an important movement in Paris, when he is giving in his own words, 'the narrative of what had been done during the year 1877,' or 'the whole evolution of Positivism during that year.' Nor again as to the 'Subside,' is it true that my special charge is that of 'laxity in urging subscriptions by which he was himself to profit.' It is his manner of presenting the results obtained that will be found to be the main point of my unfavourable comment. Whilst on this topic I would add that the former charge would not have been a light one. Compare the early circulars of Auguste Comte, which enter fully into this institution, 'on which he laid peculiar stress,' and then say whether the Director of Positivism, whoever he was, was not incurring a grave responsibility if he neglected to maintain it and develope it. M. Laffitte's carelessness on this point has been very injurious to our efforts, and no personal considerations should have induced him to deviate from his Master's tradition.

IV. With regard to M. Laffitte's extreme desire for concord which led him not to answer my letter offering to be guided by his judgment in a difficult matter, I may say that such a feeling ought not to have determined him. One who has not the nerve, when a difficulty is submitted to him by one next in station to himself, to resolve that difficulty, but prefers leaving a then willing subordinate in suspense for a long time and ultimately wholly without any decision, may be this or that, but he abdicates by such conduct his directorship, and abdication is easier than resumption. 'Those of us,' says Dr. Bridges, 'who differed from Dr. Congreve

* The circular in question is given later with the other circulars.

acquiesced in this inaction for the same reason.' This is a careless utterance, as may be seen from the following extract from a letter of Mr. Beesly's of the time. 'We were aware that you had laid the matter before Laffitte. If any one's judgment could have altered our view of such a question, it would have been yours. From Paris we do not expect a stringent interpretation of the marriage obligation. If Laffitte should take your view, as no doubt he will, he must consider our protest as addressed equally to him.'

V. (p. 7 note*.) If the letter from Dr. Sémérie, here alluded to, be, as it possibly will be, published, the judgment on Dr. Bridges' treatment of it may not be in favour of the candour of such treatment.

I proceed to deal with one or two inferences. Those who read my circular will form their own opinion of the language in the second paragraph. There is, I venture to say, no ground for the assertion that I aim at being, or think it possible that I should be, the new Director. A Director of the whole body is in my judgment unattainable at present. In a sense, I take the lead or form the centre of a co-ordinate group; all else events must determine.

Dr. Bridges refers to my quotation of a passage in the 4th volume of the *Positive Polity* (p. 471 *E. Tr.*) and gives his view of the bearing of the pages which precede it. I invite all who read his or my appeal, to refer to those preceding pages and see whether they quite bear out the interpretation put upon incompetence.

I must here renew my assertion that all attempts to make out that M. Comte had in any way looked on M. Laffitte as competent to take an active lead—'to be a colleague, if not yet a successor,'—had in any way designated him as his successor, will break down against the facts. That he was to be a Priest is nothing to the point. One other person is mentioned in the will as *equally* apt for the office, two as certain to be qualified, two as by their moral nature and synthetic character so pre-eminent as to justify a dispensation from all the lower theses. The priesthood conveyed in M. Comte's lifetime nothing of direction. I assert also that it was not on the ground of any special pre-eminence as a

colleague that he was named president of the executors. It is however most desirable that the will should be published for the light it would throw on all these questions. I assert also that there was room left for hesitation as to the choice of a leader—ample room : and I had fuller cognizance of all the debates than Dr. Bridges. I assert moreover that neither then nor since has M. Laffitte felt that he had claims to a spiritual position which he could press to their legitimate extent. He accepted it as the voluntary concession of his equals and on no other terms. Let me challenge Dr. Bridges to procure from M. Laffitte a printed denial of this my statement—a printed confirmation of the theory he advances. Till he does so, his reiterations of M. Laffitte's half-nomination by M. Comte are not creditable to his accuracy.

The subordinations which are insisted on (p. 2) are accepted by all. But in the present instance I do not see their peculiar applicability. In the special circumstances in which our religious movement was left by the death of its founder, it must be clear I think to all who will reflect on it, that its director should be energetic in a high degree ; should have a strong character, issuing in a sustained activity ; and I am not aware that any of those who most admire M. Laffitte claim this for him. Dr. Bridges is, I imagine, under a mistake on one point. He supposes, if I do not misinterpret him, that substantially I agree with his estimate of M. Laffitte, and that I have ungenerously, ' curtly,' condensed my recognition of his merits. I wished to avoid discussion of them. Why not take my words in their simple meaning ? But driven to some expression by Dr. Bridges' exaggerated language I will keep myself as much on the defensive as possible. I will simply say that I cannot see the good of such language, which is only provocative of attacks. It can not benefit the object of praise, to give him much which his best friends cannot endorse. I can not accept his "singular modesty, his calmness of political judgment." To me it sounds absurd to speak of wealth and fame as being so easily to be won by M. Laffitte. Nor with a longer knowledge of him, and closer acquaintance than Dr. Bridges has—I have for 21 years acted by his side—have I been so impressed as he seems to be with the charm and

beauty of his nature—though I am not insensible to his social attraction. I consider it also an extreme overstatement to say that they have never failed to rally those whom transient revolutionary excitement or the suggestions of a skilled mal-content had for the moment drawn aside; for it implies that there have been frequent settings aside of M. Laffitte's authority—whereas the contrary is the case. Dr. Bridges will find that others will judge, and that with better opportunities and higher competence, differently from himself. He may find that others have judged quite differently.

In the presence of heated overpraise, which has for its object to run me down, it is difficult to give a calm estimate of a man. Nor is it necessary for me now, any more than previously, to do so. My contention is that he is not on the right track as a director—not in the true tradition of Auguste Comte. My judgment may be wrong, but no insistence on the high importance of the intellect, which no one contests, or appeals to certain expressions in circulars, are sufficient to alter it.

This thorny personal question met, as I am obliged to meet it, I pass to the more general consideration. A direct negative to an assertion advances us little. What Dr. Bridges alleges—I need not enter into his enumeration of elementary truths, which we all accept, if here and there a colour is given which might be matter of fair discussion;—but what he alleges in favour of M. Laffitte's direction—it is to that, be it remembered, not to his personal work, that my objection lies—is, without any exception, already treated of in my circular. No special task was bequeathed by Auguste Comte to M. Laffitte. It is to the whole of his disciples that he addresses himself, and there are some of those disciples who do not think M. Laffitte's labour wisely directed, when so concentrated on the work of instruction. It is the issue between him and his opponents whether he has been right in his persistent efforts—have they been persistent since the beginning?—to form a small body of men competent to fulfil the theoretic conditions of the Positive priesthood. And the moral and practical, what of them? We think he has been far too exclusively intellectual, and too little concerned with the moral and practical side of our movement. So divergent

is our estimate, that we think it time to act apart, and insist more on what we think he has neglected. We have observed him: I have had great opportunities of doing so, and it really is of no use to be very angry because our observation does not lead us to the same conclusions as Dr. Bridges adopts. His counter-judgment must go for what it is worth, but in any case it is but a counter-judgment.

More than once Dr. Bridges allows himself to sneer at the prayers which I have introduced into our public worship. I must leave that matter to his calmer reflection. In a state of 'chronic discord' a prayer for union does not seem unadvisable, and Dr. Bridges' intellectual ability and historical knowledge will make him acquiesce in the statement that there may be cases where real union may be only attainable through what has the appearance of an act of disunion. This may not be such a case, but also it may be, and the language and action of my opponents go far to show that it is.

Some attention must be paid to results. I do not feel open to the charge of having made it a principle to judge by them. But I should be willing to accept the contrast instituted by Dr. Bridges. As far as my knowledge goes I do not think it would be unfavourable to my leadership. I do not see at this present juncture, relatively speaking, a comparative stagnation in England. I am not disposed to allow that there is a very hearty rallying round their chief on the part of the mass of French Positivists. It may be that the storm is not so passing. I allow that "chronic discord and imminent rupture" have for years prevailed here on the part of some of those who have worked with me. But then I deny their "faithful co-operation." From them I have never had anything worthy of the name. The other is the truer account. It has been "chronic discord and imminent rupture." It is two years at least since my sense of this led me publicly to renounce all attempt at direction, to disclaim an illusory title, and to request those whose conduct made such a step necessary, to consider themselves perfectly free of any obligation to acknowledge my leadership. This condition of independent action within the English body was frankly accepted by Dr. Bridges. I have at any rate not

been blind to the true character of my relations with the distinguished men who are so prominently connected with our Positivist movement in England. I acknowledge my complete and absolute failure to secure their acceptance of me as a chief. I would give that failure its just weight in judging my own competence or incompetence. Others, not I, must be the judges how far I have been to blame in the failure.

I acknowledge too a deeper and worse failure. I have been connected for years with these prominent names—with Messrs. Beesly, Bridges, and Harrison—and it is evident that I have failed to secure from them the commonest respect and esteem. Here again others, not I, must judge between them and me. I will content myself with saying, that I think they are somewhat over forgetful of their and my past—and of the past history of English Positivism.

One word more. I have abandoned no work—I have undertaken more than I undertook before. To bind the various Occidentals together is now as ever my aim, and so far as it is possible, to promote the ulterior union of all the members of our religious communion. No violence or harshness towards me will diminish my effort.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

LONDON: 17, MECKLENBURGH SQUARE.

11 *Descartes*, 90 (25 October, 1878).

Since writing the above I have read Mr. Beesly's *Remarks*. There is little which I need add. I may comment on the note in p. 2. It is true that I took the step mentioned when Mr. Beesly announced his wish for it, but he is mistaken in thinking that the first suggestion came from him. Others had suggested it, but I waited, as I stated when I made the change, till I thought the time was ripe, and his expression determined me to risk it. Liturgical worship began long ago with the invocation to Humanity and the Sacred Formula, &c.

It is too much forgotten, in all that is said or

written, that the movement is not mine exclusively, but is taken in conjunction with eminent French Positivists; as it was originated in consequence of the dissension within the Paris body. This dissension it is sought to represent as unimportant, but it was so little so, that M. Laffitte told me that he had drawn up his resignation when he found himself supported by some English Positivists of eminence, and was induced thereby to reconsider his decision.

When Mr. Beesly says he is convinced that my charge against M. Laffitte is absolutely without foundation, he is overbold—unscrupulous, in a word. When he says that he has never been able in conversation to obtain from me a single fact in support of my view, let me remind him that when I quoted a strong condemnation of M. Laffitte's general action, emanating from Dr. Robinet, 'Yes!' he said—I may not be exact as to the precise words, but in substance I am sure I am correct—'I look upon that view as inspired by you.' One thus speaking was not likely to obtain facts which in his judgment would be of avail.

As the contest is being carried on, further light will inevitably be gradually cast on the history of all this movement; and I will certainly not be borne down by the mere weight of counter-assertion based on the most complete ignorance, in many cases, of facts.

I will only say further that it is years since I have ceased to see in Mr. Beesly, what I believe he really thinks himself—a loyal supporter. I have had no such support from any of these men, and have told them so. Subordination there has been none; nor, I repeat it, any cordiality of co-operation for years. And some few words of courteous recognition from Mr. Beesly, which practically only heighten the effect of the strong detraction of the *Remarks*, cannot efface the sense of a long course of an opposite character, of ungenerous repression, when, in a difficult and uphill fight, I have had at best the sense of isolation, contented if I were but spared his overt opposition.

R. C.

NOTE ON "MY ANSWER TO DR. BRIDGES."

To this particular reprint I append a few words.

During the years that have elapsed since the rupture in 90 (1878), consequent on my original circular, the constant opposition to me on the part of what is known as the Newton Hall group has drawn much of its strength from one misconception. It has rested on an error carefully maintained, and well calculated to affect the minds of those to whom the facts were unknown. The assertion has been believed that, in separating myself from M. Laffitte's direction, I separated from one who had Comte's own nomination to the successorship—that my action was a revolt against Comte's authoritative choice. This doctrine is not avowed in the paper by Dr. Bridges, to which mine is an answer, but the argumentation of that paper is in favour of M. Laffitte's being so considered,—in favour of his virtual, if not actual, designation to that position.

This fiction—for it is a pure fiction—I controvert in *My Answer*. I add on the present occasion, as it survives, some short extracts from unquestionable authorities, which may serve to show its absolute baselessness. It is important to insist on this, its true character—and I return to the subject because the mis-statements have never been withdrawn. It is a minor point, but one which has its importance, to show that my counter-assertions were well founded.

R. C.

Extract 1.

'Le premier Grand-Prêtre de la religion universelle n'ayant choisi, ni par conséquent désigné, aucun successeur immédiat . . . les positivistes désignés par Auguste Comte dans son testament, comme devant se préparer aux fonctions

sacerdotales, se constituèrent en *conseil* et décidèrent que le président de cette réunion (M. Pierre Laffitte) prendrait, à *titre provisoire*, la direction du Positivisme.—*From Dr. Robinet's Notice sur l'œuvre et sur la vie d'Auguste Comte, pp. 389–390.*)

Extract 2.

In accordance with the above statement, we find M. Laffitte saying, in his first circular (same work p. 564):—

‘Telle est la *direction intérimaire* que nous avons dû organiser.

‘Quand aura enfin surgi, sous les conditions convenables d’âge, de capacité, et de moralité, le successeur d’Auguste Comte, nous lui transmettrons alors dignement, j’ose l’espérer,’ &c., &c.

Extract 3.

Lastly, I give an extract from a letter of Dr. Bridges to me, dated (9 July, 1868) 24 Charlemagne, 80:—

‘One word more as to the question of discipline. In the ‘last pages of the *Politique Positive* (p. 542, vol. 4—pp. 469–471, *Eng. Tr.*) Comte refers to the question of a successor. He speaks of Mill, Littré and Lewes, mentioning why neither of them would do. He then says that no adequate successor ‘nor even a colleague, R. C.] has yet appeared, and concludes ‘in these words. ‘Si je disparaissais avant d’y parvenir, je déclare que le Positivisme se développerait mieux d’après les ‘libres efforts de mes dignes disciples que sous un chef insuffisant.’

‘It was quite clear that at the time of his death, Laffitte ‘was not considered *suffisant*. With all my personal regard ‘for him I cannot consider him as such even now. He has an ‘evident reluctance to assume the position. I cannot but ‘think that reluctance to be in some measure well founded. ‘Perhaps the position he actually holds as ‘Directeur du ‘Positivisme,’ is that which, being somewhat undefined, best ‘assorts with his nature and with the circumstances. Only it ‘certainly dispenses Comte’s other disciples from deferring to ‘his opinion quite as much as they would to one whom Comte ‘had himself thought worthy of succeeding him. In short I

'come back to the position which I put forward in my last letter to you, that the Positive organisation is as yet in an undefined and plastic state, and that for present purposes a degree of organisation falling far short of what we are ultimately destined to attain is now realisable, would bring to our standard many valuable adherents, and materially assist the propagation of our principles.

'I have written in a somewhat similar sense to Harrison.

'Might not the subject of this letter usefully come before your Positivist Society at its next meeting ?

Ever affectionately yours,

J. H. BRIDGES.'

'Dr. CONGREVE.

'As you suppose, Laffitte has not answered my letter. These personal and practical questions do not much interest him.'

ADDITION.

The question of ritual and prayers has been much discussed and the adoption of the practice much regretted. I am tempted to add the following note on the subject, a note written, as is evident, on my first introduction of prayer.

WIMBLEDON,

5 Nov., 1877 (1 *Frederic*, 89).

DEAR DR. CONGREVE,

I am rather behindhand in the expression of cordial thankfulness for the important step taken by you on Sunday, October 21 (*Descartes* 14). I do not, however, regret the delay so much, because the repetition of the prayer to Humanity yesterday gives it the essential character of permanence. I think we shall all wish to have the precise words, destined as they are to descend to a very remote future.

I remain, dear Dr. Congreve,

Sincerely yours,

J. H. BRIDGES.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH M. EMILE LAPORTE.

PARIS, 6 St. Paul, 91 (26 Mai, 1879).

MONSIEUR CONGREVE,

Dans sa séance du 28 César 91 (20 Mai, 1879), la société positiviste de Paris a décidé que, puisqu'elle était essentiellement destinée à préparer et à soutenir l'action de la direction spirituelle dans l'installation de la doctrine et l'application de la politique positives, la scission que vous avez publiquement consommée avec cette direction par vos circulaires comme la divergence que vous avez accusée envers les procédés de propagande qu'elle emploie et qui sont les principaux éléments d'activité de la société positiviste, ne constituaient plus une suffisante communauté de vues pour maintenir votre co-opération à ce groupe, et, qu'en conséquence, d'après ces considérations, il convenait de vous demander votre démission de membre de la société positiviste de Paris.

La plupart des positivistes qui ont été de cet avis, et au nom desquels je vous le transmets, m'ont spécialement chargé de bien vous assurer qu'aucun motif d'antipathie personnelle ne les avait poussés à prendre cette détermination, mais seulement afin de ne pas nous laisser détourner de notre action sociale par des agitations intérieures peu dignes du grand œuvre que nous poursuivons. Qu'au contraire, en ce qui vous concerne particulièrement, quoiqu'ils regrettent profondément votre séparation, ils vous conserveront toujours un bon souvenir et vous seront toujours reconnaissant des grands services que vous avez rendu au Positivisme.

Salut et respect,

EMILE LAPORTE,

80, Rue Vanneau (*sic*), ouvrier mécanicien.*Vice-Président de la Société
positiviste de Paris.*

MONSIEUR RICHARD CONGREVE,
17, Mecklenburgh Square, Londres.

[Translations of these French letters will be found at the end of the volume.]

A M. EMILE LAPORTE, 80, *Rue Vanneau*, à Paris.

LONDRES : 17, MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, W.C.
Le 21 Homère, 92 (le 18 Février, 1880).

MONSIEUR LAPORTE,

Enfin je viens répondre à votre lettre du 6 S. Paul 91 (26 Mai, 1879). J'y ai mis peut-être un peu trop de lenteur, mais il valait mieux se donner du temps.

Je suis très sensible à la convenance que vous avez mise dans une sommation qui a dû vous coûter si vous vous rappelez tout ce qui s'est passé. Je vous en remercie, en regrettant cependant que vous n'en ayez pas usé de même vis-à-vis de nos deux éminents co-religionnaires, les docteurs Audiffrent et Sémérie, car ils le sont enfin, et ce titre aurait dû vous faire hésiter.

Je remarque que ce n'est pas le président de la société positiviste qui m'invite à me retirer, et il m'est permis de douter qu'une invitation provenant d'un autre que le président soit valide. Ce doute est confirmé par la lettre du docteur Audiffrent, beaucoup mieux renseigné que moi sur la constitution de la société,—mais je n'insiste pas.

La société positiviste, telle que l'a constituée Auguste Comte, existe-t-elle de fait ? A ce propos je vous cite un passage du discours de M. Laffitte du 4 Frédéric 89, 8 Novembre, 1877 (*rédaction Dubuisson, acceptée par M. Laffitte*), et qui a circulé parmi les positivistes. 'La société 'positiviste, telle qu'elle existe actuellement, n'a pas cette 'destination (politique), ce sont des amis (*soulignement Dubuisson*) se réunissant le mercredi chez le Directeur du 'Positivisme dans le but de se voir et de causer des choses qui 'les intéressent. C'est un salon, et non un club.' Ce n'est pas là précisément le rôle de la société positiviste et une telle réunion d'amis n'a guère qualité d'agir en son nom.

Depuis longtemps, la réunion du mercredi a eu un caractère hybride, tout en conservant son nom primitif. En m'y présentant, j'ai voulu faire acte de fraternité positiviste en dépit de nos divergences quelconques et conformément aux déclarations de ma circulaire initiale. L'accueil que l'on m'a fait n'a pas été de nature à m'y faire revenir ; mais me

retirer de la société positiviste,—non. Je préfère laisser à cette réunion telle quelle la responsabilité de l'initiative.

Vous reconnaissez que l'on m'a des obligations, et, en effet, j'ai rendu des services. Que l'on dise de moi ce que l'on voudra, les faits restent ; c'est grâce à mes efforts persévérants pendant une longue série d'années que vous avez pu même conserver votre local,—les chiffres attestent la vérité de ce que j'avance—et ce n'est là qu'une minime partie du constant appui que j'ai prêté à la direction telle que nous l'avions jusqu'en 90 (1878).

Un mot sur la direction spirituelle de Paris. Elle est pour moi toujours dans les œuvres d'Auguste Comte. Tôt ou tard, elles nous jugeront. Jamais je n'ai bronché. Dès les premiers jours, j'ai suivi ses indications en mettant l'église avant l'école, le culte avant l'enseignement. Ai-je tort, ai-je raison actuellement ? Ce qui est certain, c'est que je ne sors pas de la tradition du maître. Sur la haute question ainsi soulevée je récusé absolument la compétence de la réunion que vous représentez.

Je dirai en terminant qu'il y avait mieux à faire de la part de votre groupe. C'était de ne rien faire qui pût aggraver la tension, de pousser à l'union plutôt qu' à la scission. C'est là le but que je me suis proposé dans les limites du possible. Je vous invite à m'y aider.

Je n'oublierai pas la bienveillance que vous m'exprimez comme organe de votre majorité ; elle m'est précieuse.

Salut et fraternité,

RICHARD CONGREVE.

Je livrerai nos deux lettres à l'impression.

LIVE WITHOUT CONCEALMENT.

The following correspondence in the main explains itself. I have given M. Laffitte's letter as he chose to give it himself in his circular—my own in full. The latter has a part, therefore, which has nothing in his, as there published, to correspond to it. My remarks have reference to the publication of some early mathematical work of Auguste Comte's, of which I questioned the advisability, and the matter has no relevance to the particular object of the letters.

R. C.

LITTLEHAMPTON,
13 *Gutenberg*, 92 (24 *August*, 1880.)

PARIS, 3 *Homère*, 92 (10 *Février*, 1880).

MON CHER MONSIEUR CONGREVE,

Je viens de lire une brochure publiée par M. Sémérie, à propos de l'article 7 du projet de loi de M. J. Ferry. Dans cette brochure, l'auteur se livre à mon égard à des appréciations dont la forme blesse toutes les convenances envers un homme que M. Sémérie a pendant vingt ans proclamé comme son chef et maître, et envers qui, suivant l'usage universellement accepté, il aurait dû tout au moins respecter un long passé de relations habituelles.

J'ai pu, mon cher monsieur Congreve, accepter, au nom de votre groupe, une participation à mon subside personnel, qui était de votre part une obligation morale stricte, comme vous l'avez dignement reconnu, mais qui, accomplie malgré nos dissidences, honorait le Positivisme en prouvant que ses adhérents remplassaient leur devoir en sachant surmonter les perturbations de la lutte ; j'ai pu, dis-je, accepter ce subside, malgré la forme violente donnée à leurs attaques par quelques-uns de vos adhérents français, en l'attribuant à une première vivacité du début. Mais, aujourd'hui il n'en est plus ainsi : c'est après plus de deux ans que se produit une telle manifestation : il m'est par conséquent impossible d'accepter aucune contribution personnelle au nom de votre groupe, à moins que l'auteur de la brochure ne soit personnelle-

ment exclu de toute participation à une telle contribution. En prenant une telle mesure je reste dans la position absolument défensive que j'ai toujours conservée et que je conserverai toujours ; sachant trop la haute obligation morale que j'ai contractée de consacrer toutes mes forces au service de la religion de l'Humanité, sans en détourner la moindre partie pour des luttes personnelles que la Postérité saura apprécier.

Bien à vous,

P. LAFFITTE.

À M. PIERRE LAFFITTE, 126, RUE D'ASSAS, PARIS.

17, MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.

21 *Homère*, 92 (18 February, 1880.)

CHER MONSIEUR LAFFITTE,

Daté le 10 Février je n'ai reçu votre billet que le 13 le soir.

S'il eût dépendu de moi, comme mes amis Français l'avoueraient, beaucoup de choses eussent été supprimées, et je dirai plus—ont été supprimées. J'ai toujours fait ce qui j'ai pu pour retenir plutôt que pousser. Je tiens à conserver la plus grande modération de formes. Quant au fond je réserve mon appréciation.

Mais avez vous conservé une position absolument défensive ? Permettez-moi de vous citer votre dernière circulaire p. 14, le paragraphe ' Quand je dis, ' &c.

Le ton dédaigneux que vous y affichez est peu conforme à une telle attitude et peu adaptée à concilier des adversaires. Y respectez—vous votre passé avec MM. Audiffrent et Sémérie ? En tout cas il n'est que trop naturel que ceux que vous appréciez comme ayant si peu d'importance ripostent et fassent des efforts pour vous donner tort. Et on pourrait vous objecter : s'ils ont si peu de prise sur le public, pourquoi vous inquiéter ?

Je dois ajouter qu'envers moi en Angleterre vous n'avez guère conservé une attitude purement défensive. Vos conseils ont été assez agressifs.

Mais du reste, notre groupe est lié par des sympathies générales avec un certain désaccord, et de bonne heure j'ai

soigneusement indiqué l'action, non pas directrice, mais consultative, que je me réserve. Par ma circulaire sur l'organisation positiviste actuelle j'ai indiqué aussi ma subordination au Dr. Audiffrent dans le cas où il consentirait à prendre et prendrait effectivement la direction à Paris.

Pour moi l'unité positiviste reste intacte, seulement nous nous groupons à notre gré librement. Et je ne comprends pas le ton excommunicatoire qui règne chez vos adhérents et un peu aussi chez vous.

Quant au subside, d'après vos chiffres, la modeste somme que vous demandez comme entretien personnel sera atteinte, je le crois du moins, car votre subside sacerdotal devrait passer avant les frais divers, n'est-ce pas ; ce qui résoudrait en pratique la difficulté.

Mais rien de plus clair—votre acceptation de nos offres est facultative, et vous pouvez y attacher vos conditions. Celle que vous cherchez à m'imposer, l'exclusion personnelle de M. Sémérie de notre groupe—car c'est là la conclusion finale, n'est-ce pas, de votre lettre,—n'est pas acceptable ; comme vous le jugez vous-même, je crois, au fond. Autre chose est de regretter une attaque ; autre chose est de rompre avec celui qui l'a faite. J'en ai essuyé tant moi-même et de plus graves. Que vous rompiez avec lui, rien de plus naturel, mais l'exiger des autres—nous n'en finirions jamais. N'etes-vous pas lié avec M. Harrison qui m'a dit implicitement que je mentais ? Ce serait une guerre *internécine* et peu dans l'intérêt du Positivisme.

Tout en acceptant l'opuscule mathématique, je renouvelle ma protestation contre sa publication, la croyant intempestive, si non prohibée. Mais ceci dit, je le recevrai en vous remerciant. Patientons.

Bien à vous,

RICHARD CONGREVE.

P.S.—2 *Aristotle* 92 (27 Février, 80). Je joins à cette lettre de la date du 21 Homère l'accusé de réception de l'opuscule en vous remerciant.

Vous publierez, je n'en doute pas, ma réponse en même temps ; je vous y engage.

R. CONGREVE.

SERIALS.

No. 1.]

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY,

OR

HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

A SERIAL.

*A CHAPTER OF THE EARLY HISTORY OF
POSITIVISM.*

Incorrect statements are in circulation, and I therefore think it useful, both for the present and for later times, to give my own impressions of what occurred at the institution of the organisation hitherto recognised.

Auguste Comte died on the 24th Gutenberg 69, Saturday, 5 September, 1857. He was buried the 8th September. I received the news in a formal invitation to his funeral, on the 7th, I believe. I could not at the moment go, but soon after, I cannot recover the exact day, I went with my wife and her sister to Paris. It was about the 15th of the month, I think. I was personally unknown to all the French disciples. I had once met Dr. Audiffrent at M. Comte's. I remember it, for it was the evening on which I received the commission to write Gibraltar; and I remember objecting that people would think me mad. Dr. Audiffrent, it was the only remark I can recall, said, 'That was pretty much the opinion men had of him at Marseilles.' M. Comte put our remarks aside, quietly adding, 'There is no one else to do it, and you should try it.'

On my arrival in Paris I met with a cordial welcome from

all the French Positivists, and found that our Master had spoken of me in a way which made them attach importance to my co-operation. It was, I found, in fact a possibility that I might be called to take the direction. The proposal was openly made to me soon after my coming. There had been evidently already much discussion of the state of affairs created by M. Comte's death ; there was a general sense that somebody or other should centralise effort, and there was uncertainty as to who that somebody should be. In an entirely new world, neither known to, nor knowing, the men who formed it, this general result was all that was at first clear to me. I did all I could to become known to all.

In the interval between the funeral and the commemoration ceremony (Sunday, September 24th) there was a large meeting for discussion at M. Lonchampt's. The larger room in his apartment was crowded. I was sitting next to Dr. Bridges, in the crowd, when M. Lonchampt came and asked me to go to another room, as a member of the religious committee. I there found Messrs. Audiffrent, Bazalgette, Foley, Robinet, all very intimate, but the first and last most of all, with Auguste Comte. The last was honoured by him with the title of his physician, and as such had been with him much of late. The question under discussion, and it was a perfectly open one, on which no intimation of our Master was left to guide us, was : who should be the one to take the direction ? I was new to the extreme vivacity of such discussions amongst Frenchmen, and watched with interest the course the present one took. It was clear that M. Audiffrent had a certain presumption in his favour, and that it was thought he ought to step forward. M. Lonchampt said to me, and as I understood him, he was quoting Auguste Comte : 'Des disciples français c'est Audiffrent qui est le plus prêt.' He absolutely refused, on personal grounds, but took a considerable lead. He had written, he said, to M. Laffitte, who had left Paris before the funeral, and who did not return till after the commemoration meeting, to call upon him to take some decided action ; and in the meantime he had another in view, if, as he expected, nothing could be got from M. Laffitte. Dr. Foley said he would take the place, if Sophie (Madame Martin Thomas) would recognise him, but

this was most strongly objected to. All that occurred in reference to me was this. In the midst of a hot discussion Dr. Audiffrent, turning to me, said, "Our honourable colleague might equally put in his claim to the succession." Whereon Dr. Bazalgette said, "We might make a worse choice." Finally the meeting broke up without any decision. It was thought better to wait.

At the commemoration ceremony at M. Florez's, I remember that after some delay, just before Dr. Robinet, who was to preside, came in, Dr. Bazalgette entered and took a chair by me, saying, "It is all decided; M. Robinet will take the place." I gathered that in a separate discussion this decision had been formed, and I thought the proceeding irregular. I merely intimated my opinion to that effect. After the meeting we walked home with the Robinets, and Dr. Robinet modestly said, 'That he felt very unequal to 'the charge, but that he had consented to accept it to fill the 'gap (boucher le trou); and it was at Dr. Audiffrent's instance 'that he had consented.' He had been the other who had been in view.

Shortly after M. Laffitte returned to Paris, and we had another meeting of the same persons as before, only with the substitution, unless my memory plays me false, of M. Laffitte for Dr. Foley. This time we met Rue Monsieur-le-Prince, and the discussion was very quiet. I had formed my opinion that the best course was to appoint M. Laffitte, and exerted myself in that direction. So far as I could judge, he was the most moderate, as he was by common consent the most encyclopedically trained. He himself showed no wish for the office, was evidently reluctant to undertake it, but put forward no other; and all present finally acquiesced in this settlement.

It was not till later that I learnt more details of what had passed. It had been deemed desirable that a French disciple should take the place, and the others had assented to Dr. Audiffrent's judgment in this respect. So little warrant is there for a statement, which, considering the purpose it is meant to subserve, is most reprehensibly careless. I allude to a statement of Dr. Bridges': 'Dr. Audiffrent in 1857, as now, being very anxious that Dr. Congreve should assume the leadership.' This is the simple contrary of the fact.

Throughout, as I have said, there was no sense that M. Comte had in any way altered his deliberate decision given in the fourth volume of the *Politique* or that his disciples had the slightest indication of any leaning in his mind to M. Laffitte. I may appeal to Dr. Robinet's account for a confirmation of my impression on this head. We all spoke and acted as men perfectly free in our choice, and there was no one of us but was at that moment prepared to bow implicitly to any expression of opinion, any the slightest preference openly shown on the part of our Master. Any assertion to the contrary I am warranted, from my own knowledge, in maintaining to be wholly groundless. It is well to avoid the construction of any legend—well to remain in the domain of the strictly real. For the rest the Will, when published, will speak for itself, as to any such asserted change in M. Comte's purposes. It repeats the statement above alluded to, that no successor was found.

The choice made was a good deal discussed, and not by any means always with approbation. Where all was unknown, we could but wait and see. I have ever remembered M. Lonchampt's kindly expression to me when I was leaving: 'You have seen how matters stand, and that there has been under all a good deal of the spirit of *côterie*—but try and draw the veil over it.' If I have spoken now, it is with cause, and I have simply recorded my impressions.

All things considered, it was a pleasant time, with much that was genial in it, and the predominant impression it left on us was that of a general devotion to the great cause in which we were associated.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

17, MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.

1 *Descartes*, 90 (8 October, 1878.).

No. 2.]

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY,

OR

HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

A SERIAL.

THE PRESENT OF POSITIVISM.

The publication of the circular of 28th St. Paul 90 has led to some expected—some unexpected results. It has, at all events, cleared up matters, and the feelings it has called out have shown how unreal was the apparent union which existed previously, and which was in the way of becoming exceedingly oppressive.

I would review, in a few quiet words, the situation as it is constituted by that circular, my aim being to obviate what I consider the exaggerations now current, in whatever shape they may present themselves. Calmness of judgment is the most indispensable requisite for all of us.

The direction instituted in 1857 was an *interim* direction, and was so understood by all the parties to it. (*See M. Laffitte's first circular*). The institution of it was natural and inspired by the best feelings. The only flaw in it, to which we then were all blind—by all, I mean in the first place the five who concurred in it, and secondly the general body of the then disciples—was the neglect of our Master's express judgment as given in the *Politique* (Vol. iv., p. 471, *E. Tr.*), and repeated in his will, as far as regarded the fact on which that judgment was based: 'Son digne successeur, qui n'est point encore trouvé, malgré mes généreuses illusions.' Time has convinced some of us that our disregard of his intimation was unwise, that a truer, deeper veneration would have been

wiser, and that he was completely right in his forecast of our future. Two out of the four who made the original nomination, Dr. Audiffrent and myself, have resolved to retrace their steps and to adopt, however late, the course prescribed to them, and others are ready to group themselves around them and to support their resolve. Soberly viewed, what is there in this to excite indignation ?

A spiritual power, in whomsoever it reside, must be freely followed. If it cannot command a voluntary adherence it has no means at its disposal to secure any other. It is, however, the duty of all those who have given such voluntary adherence not to withdraw it lightly—that is evident—but on the fullest consideration, and as an imperious necessity, if we would discharge our trust duly.

Deliberately, then, we who withdraw our adhesion replace ourselves in the position which Auguste Comte wished us to take at his death. Without dismay, his language is firm and encouraging in its sound. He contemplated—and we may be sure that his thought had been actively engaged on the subject—what I may call a dispersive period of Positivist effort, which should terminate, as a result of the free energy of his various disciples, sooner or later, in the spontaneous emergence of a true successor. To the constitution of a visible unity in that successor, the real unity of purpose which would animate all his true disciples would naturally tend. No assertions, however bold, can shake the fact that such was Comte's final judgment.

To such a dispersive period we find it necessary to recur. It is less dispersive, or probably will be less dispersive in character, than it would have been at first. So far the time need not have been lost. The concurrent efforts may, by virtue of our past, be more centralised than, but for it, they would have been. But they must be for the immediate future concurrent and parallel, not as they have been, more in appearance than in reality however, on one and the same line.

The body of the disciples of the Religion of Humanity remains unbroken, and is, I well believe, animated by a real unity of purpose, though the premature attempt to secure a visible unity has broken down hopelessly for the present.

Philosophically considered, the failure of such an attempt is a remarkable confirmation of Comte's objection, so constantly recurring, to all partial solutions, as obscuring and interfering with the true settlement. But we may face this result with the same confidence with which our Master faced it, and without bitterness proceed to do our common work energetically. In the free union of those who are in complete sympathy with one another we shall find greater strength than in the nominal if larger union which has hitherto prevailed, and in which, had it continued, we should have had to sacrifice much force in order to preserve at a great cost a semblance of cohesion.

If, rising above the incidents of the present contest, we look at the matter from the standpoint above given, I cannot but think that the true wisdom of all is quietly to acquiesce in the conditions of our future action, as determined by my circular, conditions which may be modified for the worse, but cannot, it must be plain, be essentially changed. The small Church of which we are members, in its nascent state, is composed of all true believers, and needs the services of all with as little waste as possible. It has not as yet found its visible head. It is not probable that it will find such head in the lifetime of any of the original disciples. But as a collective spirituality in the midst of the world it seeks to benefit and guide, it may act most usefully in the present, it may prepare a sound basis for the future.

The various groups of which it will be composed, be they two or more, groups determined by the affinities of their members, need have no hostile attitude—will not have any, when the heat shall have spent itself which has been evolved by the process of decomposition with a view to ultimate recomposition of a higher order. A certain degree of heat is the natural, almost inevitable, accompaniment of such a process in social life. All should endeavour to restrain it within due limits. Under a wise self-restraint there is no real ground for discouragement in the existing division. It has its painful side—that all must feel—and will leave its scars. But the greatness of the service to which we all have devoted ourselves, each in his separate way, if it have not power to remove the pain and obliterate the scars, should

have power to brace us all up to a peaceful, inaggressive, though distinct co-operation.

The co-operation of distinct Positivist groups, or even individuals, such is the best we can attain for the present. We must wait and watch for what we all feel would be the higher condition of things. I have endeavoured in these few remarks to avoid anything which may interfere with the co-operation, anything which may divert any from bringing his utmost contribution to the work of ultimate unity.

One word I add, in accordance with a valued friend's suggestion, to avoid misunderstanding. Under the conditions which events have prescribed to us we should aim at as much union within the groups formed, be they two or more, as is attainable.' In offering myself as a centre for such a group, I will shrink from none of the responsibilities which attach to my action. As much as possible I wish to avoid any idea of command which may inhere in the term *direction*, and take the purely consultative attitude, which is the proper characteristic of priestly action. I am ready, that is, as I have been ready in the past, to help all who seek help, to the fullest measure of such ability as I have, by counsel, by teaching, in consecrations and the most carefully weighed judgments on passing events. Direction in this sense I offer. Over and above this, for the group will include some whose age and competence place them out of the need of such help, I offer myself as a centre of the general efforts, and accept such free recognition of me as they are prepared to give.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

17, MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.

11 *Descartes*, 90 (18 October, 1878.)

No. 3.]

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY,

OR

HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

—
THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.—
A SERIAL.
—*QUESTION OF THE STUDY OF THE PHILOSOPHIE
POSITIVE.*

A point incidentally raised in the course of our discussions offers a real interest to all the disciples of Auguste Comte, an interest independent of all particular issues.

In Mr. Beesly's 'Remarks' there occurs the following passage: 'When one of his followers formally protests against the republication of Comte's Positive Philosophy.' The quotation is sufficient for the object in view. The allusion is to Dr. Audiffrent, as I ascertained on enquiring, and scarcely gives an adequate representation of the matter.

Let me state it somewhat more fully. The executors of M. Comte were asked by their president, M. Laffitte, to sanction the publication of a fresh *condensation* of the Philosophy. I regret to say that I gave my consent without due thought. With a more thorough knowledge of our Master's intentions, Dr. Audiffrent refused his, giving his reasons for such refusal. Miss Martineau's condensation, accepted by Comte, and since translated into French, was, he thought, sufficient—another could only, he urged, draw men back to the earliest stage of Positivism, and divert them from the Positive Politics. To this formal protest which,

note, is not against the republication of the Philosophy, Dr. Audiffrent appended some considerations on the editions of that work issued by Madame Comte, or in her name, and on the duty of M. Comte's executors in regard to them. We are, he thinks, bound not to authorise a new edition of that work, such being in his judgment the will of the testator. Here is virtually a second protest, and that a formal protest, against the republication of the work ourselves, against our purchase of it if published by Madame Comte—a protest, be it observed, resting on the will which we have to execute. Later I may give his letter *in extenso*. For the present these remarks suffice.

Undoubtedly then our attitude is unfavourable to the study of the *Positive Philosophy*. It remains to be seen how far we are in keeping with the teachings and wishes of Auguste Comte. That is the first question at any rate for us. It is our wish to act fully in his spirit. Let us see what he says on the point. It may support us under attacks, and be of value in our conduct, as guiding us in our propagation and our own reading.

I give, first, an extract from a letter of Auguste Comte's to Dr. Audiffrent, and then, its free translation.

PARIS (10, Rue Monsieur-le-Prince),
le jeudi, 8 St. Paul, 69.

MON CHER DISCIPLE,

Dans votre lettre de dimanche soir, reçue hier matin, je suis spécialement touché de la noble appréciation où je pressens le jugement final de la Postérité sur ma sainte collègue éternelle. J'ai récemment acquis, à cet égard, une sécurité complète, en reconnoissant que sa glorification morale est irrévocablement liée à la conviction intellectuelle de l'incontestable supériorité de ma *Politique* sur ma *Philosophie*. Afin de mieux mesurer cette prééminence decisive, j'ai spécialement relu ces jours-ci la meilleure partie de la Philosophie Positive, c'est à dire, ses trois chapitres extrêmes de *conclusions générales*, que je n'avais jamais regardés depuis quinze ans. Outre leur sécheresse morale, qui m'a fait immédiatement lire un chant d'Ariosto pour me remonter, j'ai profondément senti leur infériorité mentale par

rapport au vrai point de vue philosophique où le cœur m'a pleinement établi. Nul digne penseur ne saurait maintenant méconnoître un tel contraste, ni, par suite, oublier l'angélique influence qui le produisit d'après une filiation dont toutes les phases essentielles sont nettement appréciables.

Je ne pouvais jamais trouver une meilleure occasion de vous communiquer mon jugement final, que ma biographie consacrerait, mais qui déjà circule, depuis six mois, parmi mes disciples parisiens. Il consiste en ce que, quoique j'aie dû professer, et même écrire, *le cours de Philosophie Positive*, je ne devois pas le publier, sauf à la fin de ma carrière, à titre de pur document historique, avec mon volume personnel de 1864. La préparation qu'il accomplit m'était réellement indispensable, mais je pouvais l'éviter au public, où la marche du positivisme eût certainement été plus ferme et plus rapide si je ne m'étais directement manifesté que par ma *Politique Positive*, après une régénération morale, d'une manière pleinement conforme au principal esprit de mes opuscules fondamentaux, directement dirigés vers ma destination sociale, sans susciter une station intellectuelle qui fait maintenant surgir, surtout en Angleterre, de graves entraves à notre installation religieuse.

Cette faute primitive ne m'a finalement laissé de vraie compensation durable, que de mieux signaler, d'après un irrécusable contraste, la profonde réaction philosophique due à l'ascendant spontané de mon incomparable patronne; en ce sens, je ne dois rien regretter. Personne ne s'attend à me voir finalement juger ma propre carrière avec une telle sévérité, qui pourtant n'est pas exagérée. Si le prétendu positivisme intellectuel nous suscite tant d'embarras, c'est surtout à moi qu'on doit aujourd'hui reprocher l'apparente consistance que ses chétifs adeptes n'auraient jamais acquise sans la consécration systématique que mon premier grand ouvrage semble leur offrir, et qui suffirait pour vous expliquer le soin spécial que je mets depuis quelques années, à détourner les nouveaux disciples d'une telle lecture à laquelle les anciens doivent leurs principales imperfections.

[TRANSLATION.]

What more especially touches me in your letter of Sunday, which reached me yesterday morning, is your noble appreciation of my sainted and eternal colleague: for I see in it an anticipation of the judgment of Posterity upon her. I have attained of late a complete sense of security on this point, from having come to feel that her moral glorification is indissolubly bound up with the intellectual conviction as to the indisputable superiority of my *Politics* over my *Philosophy*. The better to estimate a pre-eminence of such capital importance, I have read over these last few days, with special attention, the best part of the *Positive Philosophy*, viz., its three last chapters, which give the general conclusions. I had never looked at them for fifteen years. Over and above their moral dryness, which drove me at once to read a canto of Ariosto as a restorative, I felt deeply their intellectual inferiority when judged from the true philosophical standpoint, at which, under the supremacy of feeling, I have placed myself in the completest way. No competent thinker can now refuse to accept this comparative estimate; none such can, consequently, forget the angelic influence to which the superiority of the later work is due, by virtue of a series of connections which may clearly be traced in all its important links.

I could never have a better opportunity of communicating to you my ultimate judgment, which will be ratified in my autobiography, but which has been already for six months in circulation amongst my Parisian disciples. It is as follows. It was right that I should expound in lectures, nay, even write, *my course of Positive Philosophy*, but I ought not to have published it, except at the end of my career, purely as an historical document, accompanying the volume which concerns me personally and is to be published in 1864. The preparation accomplished in that course was absolutely indispensable to myself, but I could, and ought to have spared it the Public—and the advance of Positivism in that Public would certainly have been surer and more rapid, had I come before it first with my *Positive Politics*, after undergoing a moral regeneration. I should then have manifested myself

in full conformity with the essential spirit of my earliest works (*those published in the 4th volume of the Politics, R.C.*) which aim directly at the social object of my whole life, and I should thus have avoided giving occasion to an intellectual halt, to which is traceable the present rise of serious obstacles to the installation of our religion, a remark especially applicable to England.

This original mistake has left me but one single true and lasting compensation, that, viz.: of pointing out, as a consequence of a comparison, the force of which cannot be denied, the profound philosophical influence exercised upon me by the natural ascendancy of my incomparable patroness; from this point of view I may not regret anything. No one expects to see me finally judge with such severity my own career, and yet there is no exaggeration in this judgment. If that which puts itself forward as intellectual Positivism throws so many difficulties in our way, it is on me, above all, that must rest the blame, as its feeble adherents would never have attained their apparent cohesion without the systematic sanction which my first great work seems to give them; and this is, in itself, sufficient to make you understand the special pains I have been taking for some years past, to dissuade my new disciples from reading the work in question, a study to which my earlier disciples owe their more important defects.

The judgment is clear, and may explain Dr. Audiffrent's position. I leave it to the consideration of my readers.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

17, MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.
8 *Charlemagne*, 91 (15 *June*, 1879).

No. 4.]

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY,
OR
HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

A SERIAL.

IMPERIALISM.

During the last twenty-five years, by united and individual action, we have done our utmost to press upon the public our deep conviction that "Imperialism" is the great political question of the age; that rejection and reversal of the Imperial policy, together with all ideas and schemes of empire, is the essential political condition of future progress. Not only is conquest in every form, whether by annexation or protectorate, to be deprecated, but the fundamental idea of Imperialism, namely, one centralised administration for vast and widely scattered countries, is mistaken in theory, in practice impossible to be realised, and productive of mischief and misery where it is attempted. The international organisation of Humanity must be founded on a different plan, antagonistic to aggression and war, and favourable to peaceful industry. The Imperial system is in fact a wrong solution of the great question of internal organisation and politics, namely, how to reconcile central control with local energy and efficiency. The reformation of our international policy, in our dealings with the great nations of Europe, and not less with those of East or West, whom our vast physical power allows us to illtreat with impunity, would constitute a moral revolution and would exercise the most profound effect upon the progress of Humanity. Hence the primary importance of international and colonial questions.

The difficulty has been, and still is, very great, to withstand and destroy the gross beliefs that power exercised is of necessity right and that all other considerations must yield to those of imperial and commercial needs. The only efficient weapon to combat these doctrines is religion. It is to the truly religious that we appeal, no matter what their creed may be. We urge upon them that a new religious impetus must be given and new applications made to political and international questions of the moral principles upon which all societies exist and upon which all religions are founded. The task has been to teach that national conduct must, like individual action, be restrained and directed to the highest ends, that politics must be subordinate to morals. Year by year the true political issue becomes more prominent and visible, notwithstanding the deceptions and hypocrisies of platform and parliamentary politics. Recent events have quickened the ripening process. The Government by their conduct have helped in the great work. The recent wars were not more wicked and unjustifiable than many former wars. But the public mind is to a certain extent prepared, there is more light abroad; it is more difficult to gull and deceive the public by some plausible story or delusive cry of wrong to redress or insult to avenge. In this year's wars the devices were far too shallow. The war partisans have been driven back to the last stronghold of imperial wickedness to justify their criminal aggressions, namely, that there can be no going back from that which has been done, that the actions of subordinates, however disastrous and wrong, must be supported upon the accursed doctrine of prestige or the necessity of upholding the empire.

In the past there has been in England no real difference between Liberals and Conservatives on the question of Imperialism; all differences have been secondary and superficial. The attacks now made by leading Liberals in loud and vehement language upon the foreign policy of the Government, are not and do not profess to be attacks upon Imperialism, but only upon particular forms and aspects of it which are thought objectionable. It is remarkable how every Liberal speaker, who has not advocated Imperialism, has avoided the real issue. Some of them have uttered valuable

denunciations of wrongs just committed, but nothing more. We look in vain through these speeches for any assurance in the future, for any real straightforward declaration against Imperialism. There is absolute silence upon China, Burmah, and the opium trade, though war with Burmah has long been threatened and is now imminent; silence, too, about our Indian empire, even on the part of those who are loudest in denouncing this Afghan war.

Mr. Fawcett, whose voice and influence might have lent weight to the opponents of Imperialism, distinctly advocates that which has been called the necessary continuity of statesmanship, maintaining that the Liberal party if they came into power would not be bound to retire within the limits of our former frontier. In plain words this is Imperialism, the cause of our wars and crimes, whose motto is :

"But I am in
So far in blood, that sin will pluck on sin."

Finding these Imperialist doctrines advocated by Liberals, failing to find in the speeches of the leaders of the Liberal party any real declaration against Imperialism, we are obliged to revert to what they have done in the past. In doing so we cannot but recognise and remember that it was on this very ground of Imperialism that we have fought Mr. Gladstone and his government; their speeches were just as imperial in tone, their actions, in substance and effect, were just as much based on conceptions of empire as those of Lord Beaconsfield's ministry. There are differences, no doubt. If the Liberal Government had remained in power we should not have had the Afghan war in the way in which it has now taken place; but the Government would have got into a variety of Indian complications, which would probably have involved us in war or disaster, it might have been in Afghanistan, or in Burmah, or elsewhere. No doubt many of them would have felt a genuine aversion to war, but that has never prevented our going to war in the past; not even Mr. Bright's presence in the Liberal party, first in importance although he had left the Cabinet, prevented our entering upon the Ashantee war. They have never offered to us, they refuse now to offer us any adequate security against these wars with nations of a lower civilisation; they, just as much

as the Conservative Government, are dominated by their distant subordinates. Our history is full of these wars, which, when not directed by the Government, have too often been brought about by the direct infraction of orders from home. Officials governing in distant parts of the globe know well enough that they can act, as Sir Bartle Frere did act, in direct violation of the orders and wishes of the Government, and neither be hanged for treason nor disgraced for disobedience, but in the end rewarded. The English policy in South Africa, which has recently been shown up by Mr. Chamberlain in the House of Commons, is only one picture of the usual way in which England treats the nations of inferior civilisation, with whom she comes in contact. Such disobedient and unruly subordinates are supported in their criminal proceeding, in their menaces, and in actual war when entered upon, solely from the notion that their support is necessary for the maintenance of our empire. This, which is Imperialism, has caused the crimes, wars, and miseries which England has inflicted upon the weaker races; and this, until we can tear it from our policy, will be the fruitful source of crimes, wars, and miseries yet to come. The Government may be Liberal or Conservative, it matters not; so long as this doctrine remains a vital moving force, so long shall we be liable to the shame and infamy under which we labour.

Mr. Gladstone and his Government have not shrunk from war, on the contrary, they have condoned, justified, and waged it; they have defended unjustifiable crimes solely from the imperial point of view, in order to prop up, if not extend, that imperial system which was, and now is, the basis of their political action; they defended the compulsory importation of Indian opium into China, they argued in favour of, they palliated, they justified this abominable crime solely for the sake and in the name of the empire. If there is one thing in this world palpably unjust, oppressive, and wicked, it is that of one nation by force of war and by constant repetition of threats of war, compelling another nation to adopt laws and taxation which they do not approve of; yet this was the imperial policy defended and carried into operation by Mr. Gladstone's Government. The whole policy of the Liberal

as well as of the Conservative administration in respect of peoples in Africa and in the East was based upon and subordinate to imperial interests, not to right and justice; it does not lie, therefore, in the mouths of Mr. Gladstone and his supporters to attack Lord Beaconsfield for what has occurred on the ground of Imperialism, for they are tarred with the same abomination. If they are convinced of their errors, if they will join in the formation of a real anti-imperial party to raise the banner of justice and right and make war against the imperial policy, so long the source of infamy and wrong, that would be a different matter. But there is no such change or recantation; their speeches are deceptive in their effect. Doubtless their indignation at the particular evils and crimes that have recently taken place is sincere. We may rejoice that they should assist even partially in the good fight; but unless they make an express declaration of their change of opinion, we must judge them by their past. Nowhere have they shown that abhorrence of our crimes and wars upon lower races, which is an essential feature of the anti-imperialists. Did they abhor and condemn, or did they condone the Abyssinian war, or even the unnecessary battle and slaughter in that war, that killing of the king, which has been called murder—for wilful unnecessary killing is murder? When Sir Garnet Wolseley came home victorious from that hateful and wicked war in Ashantee, but lying under the dreadful imputation of having wilfully destroyed by fire the capital of the country, shelter so necessary for men in that climate, just before the terrible storms of the rainy season set in, and having bragged in his despatches that if he had had time he would have destroyed the Bantoma, their sacred buildings, and added sacrilege to arson, who moved and seconded the vote of the thanks of the House of Commons? It was moved by Mr. Disraeli and seconded by Mr. Gladstone, thus giving the sanction and blessing of both parties in the House of Commons to the war and to the atrocities committed. How is it possible for us to believe without any express declaration that the Liberal or Gladstonian party is opposed to Imperialism? The evidence of facts and speeches makes us believe the exact opposite. Queen Victoria's reign has been rendered infamous by its Imperialism carried out

by both parties, and these last wars are the direct outcome and product of the anterior Governments, Liberal and Conservative. Cetewayo having been hunted like a dog and the bloody vengeance carried out at Cabul are the last terrible incidents in this history of aggression and crime.

But we warn the leaders of the Liberal party that a change is being wrought in men's minds. The deeds and crimes which they themselves denounce, and even their own speeches, are producing an effect that goes much further. They will have thoroughly to purge themselves of their Imperialist views and join the crusade against Imperialism, or they will find themselves of neither party. The Anti-Imperialists, long in a small minority but never silent or inactive, are not likely to be quiet now that they have gained so great an accession of strength, now that their views have begun to penetrate and move the working-classes and many of the Liberals themselves. The Government has by its conduct made Imperialism ridiculous, and has given additional prominence to the evils and dangers of Imperialism, by their device of making the throne the symbol of empire—that is, of all the injustice, wrong, war, conquest, and annexation, which are day by day more and more associated with the word empire.

We insist that the time is ripe now for action on this great question; that the Liberal politicians should be forced to advance much further than they have done in their recent speeches, which have been deceptive in effect, timorous, and vacillating. Not one of them has faced the Chinese and Burmese questions. England taxes the Chinese people by force, compels China by war and threats of war to admit Indian opium, and the Government, to our dishonour, refuses to ratify the Chefoo Convention, which Sir Thomas Wade extorted from them by threats, because it does not satisfy the commercial rapacity of our merchants. Our conduct in China forms the subject of a test question on the great issue of Imperialism; for the question always is whether our national conduct and life is to be dominated by and subordinated to Imperialism; whether our intercourse with lower civilisations is to be carried out by violence and crime for the sake of commercial advantage, or of empire—violence and

crime generally leading to a further extension of the empire—or whether there shall be a total reversal of English policy in the future,—instead of aggression, breach of faith, high-handed oppression, and cruel suppression, the substitution of a policy based on the free rights of other peoples, on justice and morality, on the duty which the strong owe to the weak.

It is then to the religious that we appeal. This is the cause of morality and religion in which we call for denunciation and condemnation of the most detestable systematic crime of which our rulers and our Parliament are guilty, and which they will continue to commit until, as in the case of the slave trade, these rulers are forced to do right by the triumphant victory of moral and religious opinion.

HENRY CROMPTON.

RICHARD CONGREVE, *Editor.*

17, MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.
25 *Descartes*, 91 (1 November, 1879.)

POSITIVIST ACTION IN ENGLAND.

This consists first in the efforts of all the disciples of Auguste Comte, the believers in the Religion of Humanity, each in his proper sphere, to spread the knowledge and practice of the new Faith, each one thus forming a centre for its propagation. As time passes, these isolated efforts will naturally run together where circumstances admit of it, and by their combination gain a greater influence on their respective surroundings. As an instance I take the case of Liverpool, where the movement of combination has begun.

For the present any very distinct public Positivist action, so far as England is concerned, is confined to London, where it has now two centres :

I. The group whose meetings are held at the Positivist School. (*Address*: 19, CHAPEL STREET, LAMB'S CONDUIT STREET, W.C.) Every Sunday morning there is a religious meeting or service there at 11.15. The service at present consists of some simple prayers, readings, and an address, a sermon in which due commemoration of the past of Humanity and of her greater servants is combined with expositions of the conceptions of her religion and the application of these conceptions to our immediate practice, whether as a nation or as individuals. As is usual in this country, these meetings are open, and the attendance is invited of all who, in the present state of doubt or disbelief, can feel that in the direct service of Humanity there may be a common bond of sympathy, whatever form they may select for such service; of all who see that the christian and theistic notions which are dominant have ceased to offer a sufficient guidance for either private or public life, and who are searching for some substitute.

Besides these directly religious meetings there are from time to time courses of lectures given, for the purposes of instruction. At present such lectures are limited to two divisions of the Positivist course of instruction, to Mathematics that is, and Sociology—historical Sociology principally. But in closest connection with this latter subject there has

been a course on Art, and a course of exposition of the leading features of the Positivist Religion as set forth in the Catechism. Any such teaching is always strictly gratuitous, and open to all who will attend. Our principle is that as we have received freely we would give freely. Due notice is given of any such lectures.

There is also at Dr. Congreve's house, 17, Mecklenburgh Square, W.C., on Fridays, from 5—7 p.m., a meeting at which any Positivist is welcome. Dr. Congreve is at all times glad to see those who may be enquiring as to the Religion or system of Positivism.

As a further means of uniting the group which the above remarks concern, we have in the last year had three social evening meetings at the School. These are not confined to Positivists in the strict sense, but admit those who are sufficiently friendly not to feel any objection to such social intercourse with Positivists. There are many who are glad to show that a considerable difference as to means does not hinder friendliness when as to the end there is so much in common.

The success of these three meetings encourages us to increase the number for next year—the year 92 (1880). They will be held on the following days:

- 1 Aristotle (26 February).
- 1 Cæsar (22 April).
- 1 Charlemagne (17 June).
- 1 Descartes (7 October).
- 1 Bichat (2 December).

On the first of Moses, the Festival of Humanity, there is in the natural course of things a Positivist gathering. The interval between the 1st of Charlemagne and the 1st of Descartes is filled by the meeting in commemoration of the death of our Founder, on 24 Gutenberg, 92; as 1880 is leap-year, this will fall on 4 September.

II. The second centre, on which, for obvious reasons, I speak shortly and with caution, consists of those English Positivists who group themselves around the Committee composed of Messrs. Bridges, Beesly, Harrison, Vernon Lushington, and Morison. Besides an address on the Festival of Humanity,

they have announced a series of Sunday Evening lectures at the Cavendish Rooms, Mortimer Street, W. So far as there is any intellectual difference, it regards solely the question of opportuneness, and bears therefore on the mode of presentment of the doctrine which both groups equally hold to be a religious doctrine. The known ability, the position, and the general estimation of the leading members of this group will ensure for them a hearing and enable them to do good service to the common cause.

I believe I am right in stating that this second group also holds meetings on alternate Thursdays for the promotion of the growth of Positivism.

In the midst of this vast population, with every sort of mental constitution existing around us, there is ample room for such differences as these two groups represent; and it is most desirable that the free energies and special gifts of all should find scope for unhampered activity. The entire convergence of all our efforts is but a question of time; their apparent divergence, a not unnatural result of a complex doctrine elaborated in the midst of a comprehensive revolution, need be no real hindrance to the advance of the human religion, in which that doctrine finds its complete expression.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

17, MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, W.C.

25 *Descartes*, 91 (1 November, 1879).

No. 5.]

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY,
OR
HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

A SERIAL.

THE OPIUM TRADE AND THE INDIAN REVENUE.

With a new ministry there had come to many new hopes, but a chill has already passed over them, and not least on the subject of this paper. The debate of Friday, June 4, is not encouraging. Lord Hartington and Mr. Gladstone hold substantially the same language, in agreement with all their predecessors. Revenue considerations in India are to decide the issue. Nor does Lord Granville help us. The deputation which waited on him, June 14, dealt more prominently with the Cheefoo Convention, but opium is the real point there too, and on neither point was anything got from the minister. His sole expression of cordiality seemed to me reserved for a remark of one of the speakers that there was no wish to embarrass the Government.

The evils of the opium trade in the past and future as regards our whole relations with China ; the iniquity of our conduct in forcing it on the Chinese Government ; the contradiction it involves with all our notions of right from whatever source imbibed ; the degradation of the national character which is a consequence of our abuse of our material superiority, as it is a consequence of all the sophistical defences with which statesmen and writers have to bolster up the injustice ; the injury to generation after generation of the Chinese people ; the souring of all the better feelings of all the better part of that people ; the widening of the separation

between East and West ; these are shortly the objections to which, be it observed, none are blind who think at all. Yet they all are set aside on one definite ground. All considerations of morality, all considerations of humanity are as nought, in comparison with one object—the maintenance of our hold on India, and the support of the revenue on which that maintenance depends.

Such is the net result of the late debate. But more nakedly than before, and I am grateful to Lord Hartington for it—for his ‘ingenuous courage’—was the question put before the nation which is called on to sanction this monstrous crime : Are you as a people prepared for the consequences if we abandon it, if we retrace our steps, and put away the iniquity, taking the burden of reparation on ourselves, as was done in regard to the West Indian Slave Trade ? Are we prepared, asks Lord Hartington, to recoup the Indian Government for the loss it would sustain ? No one, he says, has suggested this in deference to our moral feeling. It is a real gain to have the issue so definitely raised.

In strict form Lord Hartington may be right. But there must be within his reach, as Secretary for India, a proposal made to a late famine commission in India by one well qualified to make such proposal, a public servant of recognised ability and peculiar financial competence, one whose premature death I mourn with an ever deepening sorrow, the late James Cruickshank Geddes. His proposal does not directly touch the opium trade, but one or two extracts from his letters will show that it was within its range. And it is a larger, bolder proposal than his Lordship has yet had a glimpse of.

In a letter to me, dated *January 8, 1879*, he says : ‘ The Famine Commission drifts. I boldly advocated the transfer of the Home charges to English shoulders. At first Cunningham, the president, was impatient. Both he and Elliott, the Secretary, alluded to my invectives against the Government. I said, the use of phrases of that kind and the attitude of mind which led to such phrases put discussion out of the question. I had prudently written beforehand that I had no wish to be questioned or not to be questioned, and so

'at the interviews I had some advantage. Then they said 'they had no wish, far from it, to brush aside my views with a 'phrase.'

I give this extract rather fully to show that the proposal excited attention.

In a later letter (*June 9 & 10, 1879*) Mr. Geddes says: 'I am very pleased to hear that you are considering whether 'it would not be well to advocate England's assumption of the "Home" charges for which at present she draws on India. 'The subject should not be urged on your consideration unless 'it were sufficiently remote from the temporary questions and 'from mere politics. The question for you is whether this 'measure as a concrete *example* of what you enjoin as 'righteousness is fair enough and reasonable enough to be 'advocated by the priesthood and quasi-priesthood, supposing 'the clergy, theologic and other, were equal to their mission. 'I think this is one of the large and complex questions which, 'in virtue of their very complexity, call for an indication of the 'general principles, subordinate details being left to the men 'of action.'

On this larger question, financially speaking, I hope to return. What I have at present to show is that it included, in Mr. Geddes' view, the special subject of my paper. His language is sufficiently distinct. I quote from the same letter. 'There is more than enough to be done with the means thus to be placed at the disposal of the Indian exchequer. The Salt Tax should be utterly extinguished, and that crime against Humanity, the opium transactions of Government, should be wound up.'

As the greater includes the less, it is then only in mere form that the ministerial language, uttered in perfect good faith, is correct.

Be this as it may, I wish to leave to my noble friend and brother his due share of honour. But I do not wish to shelter myself behind his great authority. In so far as concerns the opium revenue, I would here openly adopt and press home his conclusion. In deference to our moral feeling, I would urge on the English nation and its Government the duty of paying for its wrong. It cannot undo the past—it can cut itself off from its perpetuation. The sacrifice is a

heavy one—so was that for the slave owners. But it is even more imperatively demanded than that was. I am bound to add that it is not the heaviest which the winding-up of our imperial account will in all probability involve. An Empire acquired as ours and cherished as ours has been in defiance of all the juster and nobler feelings of mankind will cost much in its dissolution. And the dissolution is inevitable, its mode only open as yet to our wise guidance.

I advocate then no halting, no half settlement of this opium iniquity. I would meet Lord Hartington's courage as it should be met. To all, and they are not few, who share my repugnance to our past policy in this matter I would say: our repentance or our long opposition, for there are many who have not with Mr. Gladstone ever modified their denunciation, all our feelings of hostility should take definite shape. We should accept the implied challenge. We should offer to the Indian Government full compensation for the sacrifice of revenue which a new policy would necessitate. Mr. Gladstone has well indicated where the money required is to be found—or partially indicated. He points to an increase of the income tax. I would add a revised land tax. The burden must fall—where it is just it should fall—on that portion of the taxpayers of England which has derived advantage from our Indian possessions. That portion is the upper and middle classes. They alone have been benefited, and in the private bond constituted by this benefit lies the real strength of our tie to India—not in any national interest.

Thus, by a great act of national renunciation suppressing the main source of our difficulties with China, we should have no temptation to throw any obstacles in the way of her Government when it nobly attempts to root out the pernicious practice which our misconduct has fostered. I need not enter on the other advantages which must flow from so great an alteration. It is clear that none of our public men would deny that they would be many and great.

I will content myself with the shortest possible re-statement of the position I take.

The feeling of this country becomes constantly more hostile to the opium trade. That trade yields for the purposes of the Indian Government from seven to eight millions a

year. India herself is too poor to supply the loss which the suppression of the trade occasions. For its own purposes England holds and insists on holding India. It is but reasonable that England should pay for that privilege or burden—to the complete abandonment of the indirect method of extorting the money from China at the expense of that country's best interests, or of the more direct method of wringing it from the poverty-stricken populations of her great Dependency.

The wholesome reflections as to our general position in the East, nay as to our whole Empire wheresoever its parts are to be found, which must be a consequence of thus manfully meeting an obligation imposed on us by our wrongdoing—the revision in short of our imperialist conceptions, is an ulterior object of this paper, as it was the immediate purpose of its predecessor.*

RICHARD CONGREVE.

17, MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, W.C.

7 *Charlemagne*, 92 (23 June, 1880).

* Imperialism, by Henry Crompton.

No. 6.]

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY,

OR

HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

A SERIAL.

THE QUESTION OF THE TWO POWERS—SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

[In a small private meeting, Dr. Audiffrent spoke on this question, which is of such great immediate interest. At the request of some of his hearers he put his remarks on paper. They have been printed in a Marseilles paper, and kindly translated by a friend. I submit them to the English Positivists, partly to keep up the connection with our French co-religionists, but more for their own merit, as indicating the true attitude of the new spiritual power, as evidenced (1) in the demand for a complete suppression of all state support to the clergy, university, or scientific corporations; (2) in the demand for a regime of free discussion; (3) in the recognition of the value of a genuine dictatorship as opposed to parliamentary government; (4) in the rejection of an irresponsible, anonymous dictatorship; (5) in the entire absence of dependence upon any organ of the temporal power, however eminent.]

I do not come here to make a speech—I have never made one in my life—but to talk familiarly to you on a subject which cannot but interest you, and which is in its degree one of the foremost questions of the day: the separation of Church and State.

This important subject has already been regarded from divers points of view; allow me to-day to put it in a light under which it is not usually examined. But it is first needful to say a few words on the state of the two parties which have so long been in presence of one another, and whose rivalry still troubles this old world of ours.

Since the great crisis which closed the last century so violently, these two parties have, as you know, alternately

succeeded to power, though not to maintain themselves in it. They have been called monarchic and republican ; it would be better to distinguish them as retrograde and anarchic. The simple fact of their frequent alternations of power in scarce three generations is quite enough to prove, either that they have no capacity for government, or that the principles to which they appeal as their sanction no longer answer, or ever did answer, the requirements of a situation which at every crisis becomes worse and more embarrassing.

One of these parties appeals to divine right, the other to the sovereignty of the people.

In a country where all theological dogmas are worn out by contact with the modern spirit, divine right can enjoy but little credit ; and if the sovereignty of the people still attracts the greater number, it nevertheless can claim no real superiority, since as yet it has not been found possible to establish anything in its name.

These two dogmas, divine right and the sovereignty of the people, which are always set one against the other, came into the world, strange as it may seem, almost at the same time.

In order to break down the discipline of Catholicism, Protestantism had to call forth private judgment. The dogma of equality followed as a natural consequence, and of equality was born in due course the sovereignty of the people.

By an inevitable reaction the royal power, when shaken, appealed on its side to divine right, which it needed in order to maintain itself. The Middle Ages had stood in want of no such help towards the sanction of authorities whose existence was not as yet assailed.

It will be seen that if the monarchic dogma is of Catholic origin, the popular dogma is of Protestant birth. It is not therefore the more likely to thrive.

There is on this point a good saying of Alfred de Vigny, the poet, which well describes the situation : ' The world,' he says, ' has the gait of a fool, lazily swaying between two absurdities, divine right, and the sovereignty of the people.'

We find ourselves, therefore, always face to face with two dogmas, to which their partisans equally appeal, and which are equally in discredit ; one compromises everything

placed under its patronage, the other, which has never been able to establish anything, threatens us with utter anarchy.

We have then to seek for new principles and a new direction ; where shall we find them ?

The policy of the past has long maintained itself by the impulse once given, living on routine and availing itself of the old empirical modes of government. At the end of the last century social affairs had become so complex that the old procedures of government had grown wholly powerless to deal with them. The fact is, we were then on the eve of the most radical change which has ever been effected in the human mind. But, as if to strike a balance, at the moment when the political direction found itself stumbling at this obstacle, Science was about to reveal the laws of the evolution of human society. It became, consequently, the duty of Philosophy to be the pioneer of policy, and statesmen, if they would guide aright the machine of government, were condemned to call in the light of a higher science, the knowledge of which was indispensable to all.

It is some twelve years since M. Gambetta told us that politics must become scientific. This was said here on his entrance into political life. He has contented himself with the phrase, but he has forgotten the thing.

In presence of the serious difficulty caused by the inadequacy of some and the ignorance of others, free discussion is the natural course ; I mean that we have no choice but to accept it. From no other source can arise the doctrines, whatever they may be, which are to be the basis for a new society—a new social order.

None of you will gainsay me if I speak to you of the incompetence of the State in all questions of a speculative kind. The State has no qualification for the treatment of such questions, though from habit we ask of it solutions which it is not its business to find. It has nothing to recommend, still less to enforce, in all matters within the domain of speculation. We have often been reminded that a solitary thinker may be right against the world.

It is indeed only by an abuse of authority that the State imposes such or such a belief on our consciences and our minds. A religion which should demand the patronage of

the State, would show by that very fact the discredit into which it had fallen. This is at the present time the lot of all those religions which receive any part of the grant for public worship.

But if there be in our day a religion patronised by the State, we must not forget that there is also a State instruction, and what is more there is a State science, there are State men of science.

But, I repeat it, the State having no qualification for imposing anything on our intellect or conscience, it would be more prudent for it to avow its incompetence in all spiritual matters, and free itself from the responsibility of a situation in which it has been wrong to place itself.

It must be remembered that under the regime which we all desire, which yet seems so radical, so extreme to our faint-hearted governments, France once lived for seven years. The National Convention, when it suppressed the national clergy, was driven also, as you know, to suppress at the same time all those learned societies whose too exclusive spirit checked the spring of the human intellect. It had an instinct that the great efforts towards a social synthesis might be restrained and in part counteracted by the too analytical spirit of academical science. The scientific men, moreover, of that time, as those of our day, had already lost their independence, and remained for the most part slaves of a retrograde spirit.

By insisting that a terrorized assembly should decree the dogma of the immortality of the soul and the belief in a supreme being, Robespierre began a reaction which was soon to lead to a patching-up of the monarchy. The learned societies were already reconstituted, when Buonaparte, following in the path which Robespierre had opened, became dictator. The Concordat was part of the same movement, and the University of France, with its monopolies and diplomas, was in its turn the completion of the whole.

This retrospective glance cast on events now far behind us will have shown you the extent of the evil with which we are struggling to-day, and the nature of the obstacles against which our efforts break.

We must seek our deliverance in the suppression of the

three grants for clerical, university, and scientific purposes. Our cry must be: No more State religion, no more State teaching, no more State science. On this sole condition can you inaugurate the regime of free discussion. Liberty for all, for the Jesuits and the Christian Brothers as well as for us, provided they accept the duties imposed by the State, and that they do not forget that they as well as we are citizens.

If there be some who are alarmed by these measures, who in their application would see a danger to liberty, we would reassure them by pointing out that this is the starting point of a new era. Discussion liberated from all official trammels necessarily brings into prominence the great social problems, and deprives theology of the monopoly of moral culture, the imparting of which will consequently devolve upon science. It is for science, in a word, to show us that those rules of conduct on which the religions of the past have founded human discipline, whether social or domestic—a result of which they are justly proud—find their natural consecration in those same laws which govern our double nature, both the physical and the moral.

But it must be admitted that public opinion, at present so completely astray, has not arrived at the idea of such radical measures, and must be prepared for them. We must, therefore, for the moment be satisfied with insisting on the separation of the Church from the State; and, as a practical measure, the suppression of the grant for public worship. It is certain that as a natural result of the change that will ensue, the academic and university grants will disappear of themselves.

In speaking thus, I hope I have made it clear that although I am at one with that public opinion which demands the separation of the Church from the State, I am not swayed by those passions which inflame the two existing parties, parties which, in the order of events, have no other function than to neutralize each other. It is in the name of the future, whose interests are more and more overlooked, that we must demand such a measure. The State, therefore, must not proceed by confiscation against those whom it no longer patronizes, and who are at present formed into corporations which are to lose all official character. A generous

indemnity, whether for a time or for life, should be given to each of their actual members who in any way depend on the grant for public worship. We do not desire to make martyrs. Friends of liberty, we would not wrong her even in regard to those who think differently from ourselves.

This is enough to show that I cannot assent to the exceptional and ridiculous measures which it is now endeavoured to apply so timidly to those who may consider themselves not unreasonably as the spiritual directors of a still important section of our Society. Such measures spring from a Government in its last extremity.

And now who are they who are, in the present day, opposed to the separation of Church and State, to the abolition of the grant for public worship?

They are the Jesuits, and the advocates of parliamentary Government, and among these last the opportunists, those very men who formerly were loudest in favour of the measure.

Before their last expulsion from France, the Jesuits were very favourable to the suppression of the grant for public worship. But public opinion was then against them, and there was (at that time) a Gallican clergy by no means disposed to pass under the Caudine Forks of Ultramontaniam.

That clergy no longer exists, set aside by the dogma of Papal infallibility, which was voted by efforts of the Company of Jesus. The General of the Order has thus put himself in the place of the nominal head of the Church. The French Episcopate, composed of creatures of the Jesuits, has become in their hands an active instrument, by the aid of which they hold the lower clergy under the rod, while by its means they have access to the councils of the State. They cannot then abandon the advantages of their official position.

Had the Republican party been more clear sighted, it would long since have reminded the supporters of the Concordat, that by the fact of the proclamation of papal infallibility the Concordat was annulled, and reduced to a dead letter. The very word Concordat implies concessions on both sides, but no concessions can exist when one of the contracting parties declares himself infallible. And if the Concordat is no longer binding on the head of the Church, it should no longer be binding on the State.

The Republicans who believe in the parliamentary system resist on other grounds than the Ultramontanes the suppression of the grant for public worship, but they resist it none the less.

The separation of Church and State, while it opens a new era for free discussion, strikes a deadly blow at parliamentary life. Need I tell you that it is a mistake to invest our *elective* assemblies with the privilege of solving the great questions of the day. There may indeed be among them a few isolated thinkers, though true thinkers do not, as a rule, risk themselves in such assemblies; but it is not there that we must look for those who solve great problems. Such men come forward of themselves without popular acclaim, and, sad to say, the State in our troubled times is rarely able to recognize them and recommend them to public notice. By their own efforts they force their way, and they have often nothing but the aid of opinion to enable them to overcome official rivalry.

I need not say more to prove to you, that the regime introduced by free discussion must find its natural opponents among those who seek power by means of speaking. The State, reduced under such a system to its purely administrative function, will have no other task than that of securing material order and economical administration. Perfect liberty requires a mere government of police, or something very near it, transferring to the initiative of the people at large all that the State, by its very nature, can neither enforce nor even recommend.

But such a regime does not suit opportunism. I need not point out to you that he who asserted, in opposition to all the tendencies of the time, that there is no social question at issue, is consistent in wishing still to retain the Concordat of Buonaparte, after having demanded its abolition.

On every side are rumours that the chief of opportunism aspires to the dictatorship. A dictatorship wielded as Cromwell wielded it, or Frederic, or Danton, a dictatorship which would reconcile order and liberty, and wisely preside over the winding-up of the affairs of our old world, a dictatorship which would respect all the manifestations of thought; such a dictatorship would have in it nothing that should alarm us.

But who would be bold enough to hope that such a dictatorship is the dream of M. Gambetta?

By the whole of his conduct, M. Gambetta has shown that while he loves authority he shrinks from responsibility. Take the trouble to study the different acts of his public life, and you will soon be convinced that if he shrinks so completely from the idea of responsibility, it is because he, as all those who have preceded him in power, has no fixed plan, and because he, as they, directs his course by chance, with no forecast of the future, though in former days he spoke to us of scientific politics.

An Assembly in subjection to him, at once the docile instrument of his will, and a means of repression, better sustains his authority than a dictatorship which would force him to initiate a policy, and leave him the responsibility of it. By his choice he has shown that the part of a Danton is not that to which he aspires.

We resist with all our power the anonymous dictatorship which is the dream of the opportunist chief, and which would be a great calamity for our country. To guard against it we must hasten the truly republican regime of free discussion, which, I repeat, is only possible when the grant for public worship is suppressed. This suppression will be the first step towards the complete separation of the spiritual and the temporal order.

You will soon be called upon to vote. In these circumstances, so solemn for the destinies of our country, let me remind you that your votes will have a character of exceptional importance. Let the great cities set the example to the smaller towns, by demanding from their candidates a formal pledge to vote resolutely for the suppression of the grant for public worship. This is the only means of making the era of free discussion certain, the only means of enforcing the conditions of a true republican system, and preserving us from an anonymous dictatorship, the consequences of which might be disastrous to France.

Dr. AUDIFFRENT.

RICHARD CONGREVE, *Editor*.

17, MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, W.C.

14 *Shakespeare*, 92 (22 September, 1880).

No. 7.]

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY,
OR
HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

A SERIAL.

IRELAND.

LASCIA DIR LE GENTI.

[That dense population in extreme distress inhabited an island where there was an Established Church which was not their Church, and a territorial aristocracy, the richest of whom lived in distant capitals. Thus they had a starving population, an absentee aristocracy, and an alien church; and, in addition, the weakest executive in the world. That was the Irish question. Well then, what would honourable gentleman say if they were reading of a country in that position? They would say at once, the remedy is revolution. But the Irish could not have a revolution; and why? Because Ireland was connected with another and a more powerful country. Then what was the consequence? The connection with England thus became the cause of the present state of Ireland. If the connection with England prevented a revolution, and a revolution was the only remedy, England logically was in the odious position of being the cause of all the misery in Ireland. What, then, was the duty of an English Minister? To effect by his policy all those changes which a revolution would do by force. That was the Irish question in its integrity. The moment they had a *strong executive, a just administration, and ecclesiastical equality*, they would have order in Ireland, and the improvement of the physical condition of the people would follow.—*Extract from Mr. D'Israeli's Speech in 1844, as given in Lord Russell's Letter to the Rt. Hon. C. Fortescue, M.P.*]

I requote this passage, quoted in a pamphlet entitled *Ireland* which I published in 1868, as an useful introduction to what follows, as it places us at once in the very heart of the matter. One material change has been effected since the above date; ecclesiastical equality has been given. The grievance of the alien church has been removed. With this

exception the words are as applicable now as in 1844, or in 1868.

For, old and yet ever new, the Irish difficulty is again upon us in its full intensity. The disestablishment of the Irish Protestant Church and the Land Act of 1870, which to many seemed a final settlement, are shown to have been ineffectual, as it might have been foreseen, as it was foreseen, that they would be. The gain from the former Act is evident. It takes away a complication and so leaves the true issue more distinct. There has been also gain from the land legislation, but the principal advantage derived from it is indirect. More active treatment is proved, by the comparative inefficiency of that legislation, to be necessary.

I may remark that had the treatment of the Irish Church been more drastic, more consonant with principle, a greater progress might have been made in regard to the land. The funds of that intrusive and unjust institution should have been, with due regard to vested interests, applied in aid of a wise handling of the land question, such for instance as that proposed by Mr. Bright.

Be this as it may, the land question is still open, and to its settlement will be directed the efforts of our statesmen. I shall not touch it here in any of its details, for I think, as a whole even, it is subordinate to other considerations. Whilst a wise and bold measure of change might do much as a palliative and procure a healthier atmosphere for the discussion of further advance, I conceive the time to be past, if there ever was such a time since the Revolution of 1688, when any particular measure of reform could satisfy the requirements of the Irish nation. There has been an instinctive consciousness of this fact underlying all the more recent relations of the two countries, betraying itself from time to time in the deliberate as well as in the more impatient utterances of our public men and writers, and forming the ultimate impulsion of the successive leaders of the Irish nation.

The strong political discontent, which now confronts the English Government, derives support and energy, but not its origin, from the physical distress which is recognised as existing. As time passes, that discontent assumes more definite shape, and reveals more plainly its true source. It

presents itself under two aspects, the inter-connection of which is easily seen. It is at once social and political. It aims, that is, at a very great change in the existing order of society. It aims also at national independence in some adequate form. And as its character and aims, so its origin is twofold. As social, its root is in the hereditary, deep-seated, and growing dislike to the exceptional land system of England which has been forced upon Ireland. As political, it arises, no doubt, primarily from the patent evils which the dependence on a stronger power has occasioned and occasions, but it is also an outcome of the wholesome craving for a separate state life, which, in spite of existing counteractions, is the permanent characteristic of European political order, distinctly traceable in all the great Western nations—both historically and actually.

The connection of the two aspects above given, and of the two demands which correspond to them, lies directly herein, that, without a large amount of national independence, the social changes which are desired are unattainable; the efforts made to attain them seem in the immediate future useless; they are a hope ever anew deferred. For a settlement of the land question of Ireland in accordance with the actual demand must re-act on Great Britain; and the territorial aristocracy of Great Britain is not slow to see that this is so. It is not the Irish only who are a dislanded and 'dishomed' nation, but the English, Welsh, and Scotch; and the wiser the scheme propounded for securing the end to be kept in view, viz., 'the remarrying the land of Ireland to the people of Ireland,' the more certain is it to tell on the other three home constituents of our composite Empire.

Deep in the very constitution—the aristocratical constitution—of the English Government lies then the real Irish difficulty. This is true historically—it is true also in practical politics; and when, to enable them to deal with it, the Irish seek for autonomy (the word is manifestly as applicable here as in Bulgaria or Roumelia), there comes in the one great national prejudice, fundamental and most powerful, that, come what may, Ireland must remain in her present connection with England, an integral part of the Empire, not a self-existent nation. No English Government will venture in

face of this prejudice to propose repeal. All Irish statesmen who see the necessity of repeal must use language and avow ends which are open to the charge of sedition.

Hence the relations of the two countries—I might say of the two Governments, the informal Irish and the highly organized central Government—are under these conditions very difficult. For any English ministry, with the best intentions—and I do not believe that the responsible statesmen of either party have of late had other than good intentions—and with the clearest insight which can conceivably co-exist with the above-mentioned national prejudice, will yet possibly find itself unable to carry the measures which it may deem advisable; whilst the Irish statesmen who see that national self-existence is the ultimate goal of their exertions, must feel that they are face to face with a resistance against which all the ordinary methods of political influence break without effect. On both sides, the greater the insight the less would seem the hope.

Where is the exit from this political blind alley, all violence being set aside, and only such measures advocated as are within the province of peaceful statesmanship, such statesmanship, however, being conceived capable of a revolutionary vigour?

The spirit of coercion is abroad—of violence, that is, from the side of the established Government. To their honour, the present occupants of power stem as yet the rising exasperation, though unfortunately yielding to it so far as to institute this ill-advised prosecution. Be the result of that act what it may, it is, as force has been justly said to be, no remedy. Have we not seen—each half generation, to say the least—these coarser means applied, and a temporary lull secured; and, the pressure removed, as with our Government it cannot but be, the resurrection of the spirit which had been exorcised, the renewal in louder tones of the previous demands? This has been the political experience of the last half century—the almost exact period during which even the intention of justice on the part of England can be traced. It is this perpetual recurrence of the evil which is the peculiar opprobrium of our statesmanship, and the indication of the true direction for its future efforts.

Less than ever do temporary imperfect remedies hold out any prospect of advantage. For of late years, there has been introduced an additional complication—many additional complications, I might truly say. Three I will name. First, the greater rapidity of communication and consequent increase of publicity. The whole human family has become more highly organic, so that each part's suffering is more instantly felt by the other parts. Secondly, and in part as a consequence, the influence of opinion is more sensitively felt, the opinion of other people as well as home opinion. Europe has sought to make this influence powerful in regard to Turkey—but it is a motor evidently available elsewhere than in Turkey, and the proverbial secular mismanagement of Ireland is brought to the bar of national judgments in the Eastern and Western world, in Asia no less than in Europe and America. Thirdly, the Irish famine has left our statesmen a legacy. In shortsighted satisfaction, we exulted over the removal by emigration of a large proportion of the Irish people. So the then Government saw with pleasure the expatriation of the soldiers of Cromwell. But a century later and the recoil came. American independence was in no obscure manner connected with that expatriation. So, but without the slow lapse of a century, comes the punishment in the present case. The Irish in America are a constant stimulus to their nation which will leave it no rest till it stands free and its own mistress, in full possession of itself, at home upon its land.

I write as an Englishman, from the standpoint of our national duty, appealing to the higher conscience of this nation, to its sense of shame for past misdeeds, past neglect, past lukewarmness, to its consciousness that the effects of such a past can only be slowly cancelled, to all the latent nobleness which I believe in, and which duly evoked might issue in a resolution that, cost what it might to its pride or its interest, the true advantage of Ireland, and Ireland only, should be the rule of its action.

I urge no special measures. I confine myself to the more general, comprehensive issue. It is for the Irish people when made *sui juris*, master of its own destinies, to decide on the best mode of its agricultural settlement. It is to the

making it *sui juris* that I direct myself—to the gratification of the supremely just demand that Ireland be an independent nation with full self-control.

That for a time there remained a formal dependence on the English Crown, a connection of some kind or other, would be indifferent, if the completeness of independent state existence, the essential object, were secured. All must acknowledge the difficulty of the intermediate steps. But with an avowal of readiness to accept the ulterior end, with an avowal of the determination to work towards such end, the intervening stages would become indefinitely easier. The order, to all so desirable, would be more certainly attainable, disorder having lost its sole temporary justification or palliation. The irritation of ultimate denial removed, temperate discussion of the best form of outward union, or of the best mode of effecting separation, becomes possible. Mutual conciliation on the part of two states in such close juxtaposition would equally in the present, and with an eye to the future, be the dictate of good sense, and the furtherance of the interests of both, in the fullest signification of the term, would be the common interest of both.

The task is : to reconstitute a state with whose separate existence and self-growth we have so long interfered, without any success in transforming it into the image of ourselves, as has been desired. It is a task which is being undertaken elsewhere, and with certainly not stronger motives. Its urgency in each several case is matter for consideration. When the actual condition is tolerable, such condition may well endure till the deeper changes have been wrought from which this particular change, viz., the restoration of political independence, will spring as a perfectly natural consequence. In Ireland, the condition is not tolerable. More than half the nation, I take the cautious estimate of a very moderate statesman, idolizes the man who is demanding a new state of things.

In Ireland we have but one choice,—are we not becoming convinced of it,—the choice between a revolution effected peacefully and one accompanied by violence. No doubt we may tide over this particular explosion as we have tided over others, but if we read aright the facts of the case in all their integrity, we may be sure that it will return upon us. The

tenacious memory of the Irish people, daily evidenced to the most inattentive, their geographical position, the circumstances of the whole political world in which we are living, all the doctrines which are current, the vague doctrine of nationality co-operating here with the determinate doctrine of the state as conceived by a sound political philosophy, all point to the conclusion, that, sooner or later, the solution I am advocating must be adopted, and if so, why not at once, with all due deliberateness and precaution ?

The empire of England is of most composite order, an aggregate of elements which have not been as yet, nor can ever be, welded into one organic whole. This, I feel sure, is a conviction the force of which grows daily, as the result of our dominant philosophical thought, and of the practical experience of our better statesmen. We are, however, appealed to, and the language goes home to the vast majority as yet of both parties, not to be inferior to our forefathers who won that empire, to defend it, and to hand it on with all that it involves as a great inheritance to our children. Variouslly interpreted by different minds, this is the general substance of the appeals to which we have been accustomed.

I will enter on no criticism, confine myself to no mere negation of the prevailing form of Imperialism. I put forward quite a different form, one assuredly of not less noble aspiration, nor making less demand on our intellect and morality. Not unmindful of the past, whilst we would rise superior to it, we should bend ourselves to the work of repairing what has been wrong in it, supplying its deficiencies where it has been weak ; not exerting a merely defensive energy, but the higher energy of reconstruction, of creation, of organizing within the limits which we have reached a new and better order. Not, then, any longer as the centre of an oppressive system,—oppressive in some cases as regards its parts, in others, as regards other nations,—oppressive, that is, within itself, and in proportion to its success tending to be oppressive without,—but as the free originator of a new life for a number of independent states, should the England of the present and succeeding generations at once atone for, and justify, its glorious but chequered antecedents.

More immediately, and especially, is it desirable that this

should be done for Ireland, and the first condition of its doing is that, as a people, we renounce all determination to hold Ireland against her will—a most difficult act of self-renunciation, but one that, if accomplished, is full of promise.

One serious objection will be urged. It is a matter of self-defence to us to hold Ireland. Independent, she is a danger. I should not accept this contingent danger as a sufficient dissuasive. But neither do I think that there is any real danger. Independent of England, and independent on the hypothesis of her being so by the aid of England, why should Ireland be hostile to England? Why should she, in the second place, invite a foreign power to make her the basis of its operations, and if seized against her will what value would there be in her as such basis? What power again is there into which, if her own mistress, she would be willing, given all her past history and character, to incorporate herself? It is impossible to shut out all contingencies, but within the bounds of moderate prevision is there really any sufficient danger to warrant those who accept this ground for her retention? I add that, if separate from England, there would cease all the motives for other nations interfering with her which are connected with her dependent position. She would be as little involved in any English concerns as Switzerland; of very far less interest to England as a question of danger, than some of the other minor Continental states. Are we not, in our feelings and reasonings on this head, too much under the influence of older political associations and ideas, which are undergoing, if with extreme slowness, a transformation, and adapting themselves to the new order which is felt to be appearing on the horizon. Prudence may require us not to ignore too soon the old, but political wisdom has ever consisted in a due apprehension of the new which is being brought to the birth. But, as I said above, the possibility of ulterior danger would not weigh with me as an adequate deterrent from the policy I am advocating.

That there are grave difficulties in the state of Ireland itself I am well aware. There have always been such in the way of great changes. The establishment of the Union was

not an easy task, nor the means by which it was effected delicate. Bring to the efforts of repeal and consequent reconstruction an equal energy, and the obstacles would not be found insurmountable.

In our government all resolves itself into a determination of the national will to uphold such change as the best deliberative wisdom, be it of one man or many, may think desirable. All resolves itself therefore into a modification of the national feeling and judgment. To this end each in his degree may contribute.

It were no mean result to have done with this festering sore in our national existence, which weighs upon our conscience and enfeebles our action. It were a gain of a high order to Humanity to have restored to its due perfection one of her immediate organs. I say restored, for the time was when to the general welfare of Europe Ireland largely contributed. She was a luminous spot in a darker world. The nation which through its statesmen shall make her the equal of others in a world which has become brighter will need no extrinsic compensation for any sacrifice.

In the complex organism of Humanity, as in the simpler organism of the human body, all members suffer when one suffers. The more perfect each is, the more it contributes to the welfare of its adjacent members and of the whole. In the past the rough processes of state unification have interfered with the unities which have been crowded into one political bond, and there has been a consequent blanching of the parts and diminution of their separate vitality. This may have been necessary. Is it so any longer, or are there not cases in which it is not so, in which the counter-process is indicated? It is my contention that Ireland is precisely a case of this kind, a case for the revision, in the interests of Humanity, of an unwholesome union. If, rising above the bias of patriotism, as it is usually understood, we place ourselves at the standpoint of our aims and obligations as men, we shall have little difficulty in arriving at this conclusion, however various may be our judgments as to the immediate means. To the servants of Humanity all will be welcome that enriches and beautifies her continuous existence, and we can hardly question that it would be enriched and beautified

by the re-integration of one of her organs, by its recovery of its own life, not, it may be feared, without considerable pain, but with an overbalance of ulterior good. In this spirit the surrender of cherished feelings which her service often involves, the progressive effort which it demands, will equally be accepted. Many will have to surrender much in regard to Ireland, and the effort of her reconstitution will be great, but our past imposes both upon us, and in the acceptance of this inherited combination lie at once our duty and our wisdom.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

17 MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, W.C.

28 *Frederic*, 92 (1 December, 1880).

P.S.—It is clear that repressive measures will be proposed when Parliament meets. All will depend on their character and accompaniments. Order and coercion are different ideas, and the firm maintenance of order, in its due measure, will be easy in proportion as it is kept distinct from all admixture of political compression, in proportion, that is, as it has no taste of the permanence of English rule and Irish dependence; in a word, in proportion as it is order pure that is the aim. It needs no prophetic power to foresee that whilst those other ideas are dominant there will be war between the two countries, not peace; war in one form or another. Whilst the Austrians held Italy we could accept and admire the social interdict enforced against them by the Italians. Why should we not allow for a similar social interdict aimed at our own intolerable supremacy—intolerable to the Irish, I mean. It is the only form of war left to a people held down by superior strength, a tenure of Ireland which would be as repulsive to us as to the Irish were we true to our history and professions. Yet even moderate men like Mr. Shaw-Lefevre tell us that the primary consideration is the upholding of the Queen's Government—which means, can mean, nothing but the absolute denial of the Irish wish for national independence. The outlook must be gloomy with such teaching in the ascendant.

No. 8.]

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY,

OR

HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

A SERIAL.

IN MEMORIAM DWARKA NATH MITTER.

Giudice gentil...

Nullo bel salutar tra noi si tacque.

It is not a biography that I offer, but a tribute to a memory :—and the time is appropriate, for it is the seventh anniversary of Dwarka Nath Mitter's death.

He died near Calcutta, February 25, 1874, young, a little under forty ; it seems it is difficult with Hindoos to fix the exact age. He was of humble origin, ' of the writer class, a semi-Brahminical class, partly sacerdotal and partly commercial.' His student life was brilliant. He was poor, and had to work hard to advance himself in life. He chose law as his profession, and soon became very distinguished. According to an impartial testimony, he was among the first of the many very able men of the native bar. He had to plead in most important cases, amongst others in the great rent case, the decision in which he was mainly instrumental in procuring. ' The substance of it was that the political economy foundation of rent was abandoned, and extensive privileges, limiting the enhancement of rent, were secured to large classes of ryots by the precedent. This anti-enhancement movement on the part of the ryots was the last vestige of the Indigo disturbance, and is part of the great upheaval still going on. The case was fought gratuitously by Dwarka

Nath Mitter, for the class for whom he pleaded was unable to pay anything, even of his expenses.' This was no exception. 'He was always ready to support the cause of the poor,' says Mr. Justice Jackson; 'many times, I know from my own experience, without a fee.' In due time he became judge of the High Court, at an early age, almost by acclamation; and his death, about six years after his judgeship, was felt as a general loss, and was acknowledged as such by the English Government not less than by his own community. The testimony of his colleagues to his merits was emphatic. I quote it as expressed by Mr. Justice Jackson. 'His career and conduct as a judge have, I may venture to say, amply justified the choice of Her Majesty's Government, and the expectations entertained of him. His extensive acquirements, varied learning, and rapid perception,—his keen discrimination, his retentive memory, his clear good sense, and his instinctive love of justice, made him a most valuable colleague, and one with whom it was a real pleasure to share the labours of the Bench.

'Amongst his more brilliant, though less important, qualities was his surprising command of the English language; the readiness, precision, and force with which he used that language are not usual even among those who speak it as their mother tongue, and were the theme of constant admiration. I may add, never was there a man whose performance of his public duty, and whose official conduct, was less tinctured by class feelings, sectarian influences, or social prejudices than our lamented colleague.

'As regards my deceased colleague's private character, I may add that it is only a fitting complement to his public character; his amiability, his generosity and independence of character were known to everybody, and that very quality which perhaps marred to some extent his completeness as a judge—I mean the great earnestness and almost vehemence of his convictions—only added to the charm of his character in private life. He had that eagerness which proceeds from strong convictions, joined with perfect frankness and fearlessness of character.'

One can understand that a native judge—Hindoo by origin, and with all the feelings of the Hindoo, and not blind

to the defects of the English administration—would, on great questions affecting the welfare of his countrymen, at times throw into his decisions and language something more of feeling, less impassivity, than would appear right to English judges without the same keen sympathy. Be this as it may, the general testimony above given is corroborated by all who have spoken of him. All bear testimony to his remembering his origin and its claims, to his faithfulness to his family, and his generosity to the poor, to his great liberality in regard to public institutions, to a beautiful life of singular completeness.

More I need not say on it. Our special interest in him lies in his opinions. He was, and is known to have been, a disciple of Auguste Comte. 'It is gratifying to see the native papers all announcing Dwarka's Positivism, and that with respect. The carping by the *Mirror*, the Theist paper of Keshub Chunder Sen, brings out this fact the more strongly. On the other hand, it is characteristic that the English newspapers should, with one casual exception, all ignore the circumstance.' It may be of interest to state how he came to this result. Like the majority of his countrymen who are subject to the influences of the English instruction given in India, he was early emancipated from the belief of his forefathers. This effect of the system everybody must allow to be of very doubtful good. The earlier faith gone, a state of pure scepticism remains; the Hindoos are freed, that is, from the restraints of the religion of their youth without coming under those of the religion of their conquerors. When in this state, Dwarka Nath Mitter accidentally placed his hand, in a friend's library, upon the *Catechism of Positive Religion*, and on asking the friend his opinion of the book, the friend spoke disparagingly of it, indeed rather cynically, but Dwarka was not quite satisfied with the judgment, and asked to be allowed to study the work, and judge for himself. His perusal led to a different conclusion and to a deeper study of the system of which that work is the summary. One of his countrymen speaks of the impression it produced upon him as having been very distinct, of its having changed the whole of his convictions, and given a fresh impulse to his whole character, leading him to certain fixed principles in the

place of his scepticism. Throughout his life, after that period, he continued faithfully to adhere to the doctrines of the Positive Religion, a student of the writings of Comte, and he carried his studies beyond those writings over the whole range indicated as desirable for the right cultivation of the intellect. He had, I believe, collected nearly the whole of the Positivist library. The system, in fact, was that in which he believed, and which guided him in all his political and social speculations.

I remember that in one of his letters during the Franco-Prussian War he said to me he had been completely shaken for a time by that convulsion of European order which seemed to threaten such grave consequences, but that he had induced himself to read carefully through what he had before read, the 'Positive Politics' of Comte, and that he had from that reading gathered fresh strength of conviction and greater calmness of mind. From that time forward he was never shaken in his belief, and though he died early by a lingering and painful death, he died fully convinced of the truth of the new religion. 'Remember,' he said to Mr. Geddes when he last saw him, 'remember that I die a Positivist.'

'He died a staunch Positivist, entertaining certainly a respect for Hinduism, as became a Positivist, but himself a follower of the Religion of Humanity.' From this respect for his country's religion, he acquiesced in the Hindoo ceremonial with regard to his funeral rites, and that in accordance with all his convictions. When he ceased to be a sceptic, when he adopted the Positivist faith, he re-examined his whole religious position and studied the traditions of his forefathers to see what there was in them that was good and valuable. He took up a tolerant and patient attitude, wishing gradually to modify Hinduism—to guide it, not abruptly destroy it. So, while not concealing his opinions, whilst gathering round him people who agreed with him, he respected in his family relations the Brahminical religion in which he was born. His whole domestic life seems to have been ordered upon these principles. He retained, I may mention, the supremacy of his mother in the family, though himself married and with children. In dying he was quite open. The language he used shows this, and he spoke with great

warmth, placing both his hands in those of Mr. Geddes. Concession on a point of form was under these conditions but an act of just conciliation.

I speak of this because it is the only point upon which his conduct has been impugned. He was adverse to any theological modification of the faith which we know as Brahminical; he was hostile, that is to say, to that peculiar form of it which is known by the name of the Brahmo Somaj. He was hostile also to Islam. He thought it wiser to keep the Polytheism of the Hindoo and to groove into it the higher faith of the future without any halt in Monotheism, Christian, Islamic, or the peculiar form above-mentioned. Much trouble would thus be spared his countrymen. One of his longest letters to me was occupied with a searching and unfavourable analysis of the last peculiar form of Theism.

The same moderation characterised his political opinions. He accepted the conception of Comte, that the East waits for the West. Though fully alive to the evils of the conquest and of our intrusive administration of India, he accepted the fact as the basis for future effort. In the sense of religious union he overcame his objections to the English rule, and connected himself with the Positivist community through its English disciples. My own acquaintance with him was but by letter. He wrote at rather long intervals, but at great length and fulness, with openness and friendliness, explaining his position as far as concerned his belief; moreover, with great mastery of the religion he had adopted, and in the clearest and most vigorous English.

He had hoped to come to Europe when circumstances should allow it, with the special object of making a pilgrimage to Paris to visit Auguste Comte's dwelling and tomb, as one who cherished the deepest reverence for his great teacher's memory.

For all who share our faith it is naturally an object of interest that at this early period of its existence we should have had a convert and adherent of this stamp and calibre, a man of thorough intellectual competence as well as high moral excellence, trained in the literature of the West and European learning, familiar with Western ideas, familiar also, by the fact of his birth, with Eastern ideas and Brahminical

conceptions. It is very rarely indeed—if it has ever occurred—that such an one has adopted a religious system derived from the West. I am not prepared to say that it has never occurred, but I am prepared to say that it is extremely rare for either Catholics or Protestants to have gained the adhesion of such a man; and it is with a legitimate satisfaction therefore that the Positivist enrolls among the early disciples of his faith one who stands in so marked a position. He is not the only Hindoo who has joined us, but he is by far the best known, the most regarded by his countrymen, and it is for us of the West, his fellow disciples, to give due honour to the memory of a man whose adhesion is a guarantee to us of future growth, an omen of progress, in the force of a noble example.

It is with the object of familiarising the members of our body with his name, that I print this slight notice. We associate that name with our movement and its worship by a memorial tablet in our Church, the first outward mark of the union between East and West which the Religion of Humanity alone is competent to institute.

17 MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.
28 *Homer*, 93 (25 February, 1881).

(1.) The simple commemorative tablet bears this inscription :—

DWARKA NATH MITTER.
1832—1874.
Prinipilo della santa milizia
Nell' Oriente.

(2.) Where there are inverted commas in the above paper not otherwise explained, they indicate that the words are Mr. Geddes'.

(3.) I reprint the letter which, at the time of his death, I sent to the Editor of the *Bengalee* newspaper, Calcutta.

Sir,—You will perhaps find space for a few lines as a tribute to the Honourable Dwarka Nath Mitter, from one who feels real pain at his loss, and who has a certain claim to speak from the relations which had for some time existed between him and the deceased.

More fortunate than I, some of my family knew him personally. To me he was known only by a correspondence which extends with long intervals over the last six years. He was a full but not a frequent writer. I had cherished, as

he had, the hope that we might meet some day in Europe, but it was a hope not to be realised.

His letters, the accounts of those of my family who knew him, the praises given him by his colleagues and his countrymen, all are in singular harmony as to his intellectual capacity and the simple nobleness of his moral character. It is not for me to enlarge on this topic. If I speak of it, it is to show that I appreciate the language in which you deplore his loss.

I deplore it on the same grounds as you do, but also on others which you, as you have shown, can respect without sharing. I regret in him the first Eastern disciple of the Religion of Humanity, his acceptance of which was complete, his persistence in which in presence of death was unshaken. I die a Positivist, was his earnest—eager affirmation to Mr. Geddes. It is but fitting that in the name of his Western co-religionists I express the sorrow we feel at losing him, and that by a public recognition we do what we can to honour as it deserves his noble initiative.

His premature death darkens the prospect, but it cannot wrest from us the advantage of his example. That a Hindoo of such acknowledged competence from both points of view, competence of intellect as of heart, should have found satisfaction in the new Religion, is an evidence not without its weight in favour of the universality of that faith.

There is one point connected with his adhesion which I will but mention as a valuable sign of its soundness. It revived in him a just respect for the great religious system of his country in its true form, whereas he had previously been sceptical and adverse to all religious systems. The transition from the theological belief of the East to the human must be long and difficult, and will demand from the earnest disciples of Humanity a very large exercise of all their powers of conciliation. The first condition of such a conciliation is a just respect for the ancestral ideas. Where there is this spirit, great concession may be made without involving anything that is unworthy.

One of Bengal's noblest sons has died the disciple of a new and human faith. Will none follow the example he set in adopting it, fill the gap he has left and re-form the bond

which his life had created between the East and the West? What satisfied one so competent can surely not be beneath the examination of others.

But I forbear. My object was to honour the dead and offer all I can to his memory, the full recognition of the value of his adhesion, the sorrowful expression of my affectionate admiration.

Believe me, Sir, yours respectfully,
RICHARD CONGREVE.

17 MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.
22 *Archimedes*, 86 (16 April, 1874.)

No. 9.]

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY,
OR
HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

A SERIAL.

*IN MEMORIAM DR. ARTHUR C. BURNELL.**

Dr. Burnell died at the age of 42, just at the age of maturity, bearing with him to the grave a rich store of learning, the acquisition of many years of unresting labour. The story of his life is a simple one, and need not here be given in detail. Born in 1840, he went to India in 1860; at the age, consequently, of 20, before the period of manhood proper. For 20 years he was in service in the East, on the Malabar coast, in Java, and the Madras Presidency. He paid at intervals short visits to Europe. In 1868-69 he spent a year in Arabia and Egypt. In 1879 we here had the opportunity of making acquaintance with him personally. Several will remember the evening on which he joined our social meeting in this room, and the pleasure of his lively conversation, so full of instruction. By letter my intercourse with him had begun in 1878, and continued till the end of July in the current year.

* This Paper is the substance of a Funeral Address delivered at the Church of Humanity (*Positivist School*), Sunday, November 12, 1882, a month after his death.

The visit in 1879 was mainly on account of his health, and he found that it did him little good, rather the contrary. He returned, but for a short time. In 1880 he was ordered home, in a state of extreme prostration, on a two years' sick leave. His health had given way completely under the strain of overwork. He tried Karlsbad for a time with success; but an attack of pneumonia nearly proved fatal. He was taken to San Remo, where he spent the winter with such real benefit that he purchased a house, and returned for the following winter. In the summer of 1881 he was in London, and we saw him more than once. He was present at the religious marriage of Mr. and Mrs. Nicholson, as a very old friend of Mr. Nicholson.

This year he came over for the summer. He was much shaken by his mother's death, and the unfavourable weather told upon him. He took cold, and his old enemy, the Karlsbad pneumonia, attacked him again, and he had not strength to get over the attack. On the 29th September he speaks of himself as hardly able to see or write. He died October 12th.

Some extracts from his letters will give us the best idea of what his life was, as also of the nature and extent of his work.

(1.) 'I first came to India in 1860,' he writes in 1878, 'and as circumstances early turned my attention to philology I have since been mostly occupied in editing Sanskrit (Vedic) texts, and in endeavours to search out and preserve the earlier parts of the South Indian literature, which if not discovered now must soon be lost for ever. This is hardly a Positivist ideal of work, but I have a conviction that it should be done, and that the early history of India should not be allowed to rest on the insecure foundations which are commonly accepted. The process of sifting the wheat (if any) from the chaff of Indian literature is a wearisome work, but I hope that some results may eventually be found to repay the labour. It seems to me difficult, if not impossible, for me to serve India in any other way. My official work as a judge is very heavy, and my leisure is consequently but little.'

(2.) 1879.—'I am now engaged in completing a de-

scriptive catalogue of more than 12,000 Sanskrit MSS. in the palace library here (Tanjore). I began the work (for the Government) in 1871, and every obstacle has been thrown in my way, as usual, by the Government for the past seven years. Now there is a sudden desire to see it done, and, at a time when my health will least bear it, I am urged to complete it in six months. I hope to see it done by March. When it is done I hope to visit Europe for two or three months. I left it last for India in 1870, and since then have been on the Malabar Coast, in Java, and here; such changes from steamy damp to intensely hot and dry places are sufficient to try a stronger constitution than mine.'

(3.) 1879.—'I submit the list of my works in all humility; my work has been sifting rubbish, or aiding others to do so, on chance of finding a nugget.'

Elsewhere he speaks of this Tanjore catalogue as his valley of dry bones.

(4.) 1880.—From San Remo he writes, 'My brother has brought me here to recover, but I am sadly handicapped, and stand a poor chance; but I am better and begin to want to work again. Meanwhile I am collecting materials for the volumes I wish to print next of the Positivist Library: Hippocrates, Cornaro, Hufeland. I am not allowed to do anything beyond two hours. I devote this time to improving my Italian and to getting on with the tract of Hippocrates, of which the printing has begun.'

1881. 'I have bought a cottage here and intend to spend the winters here. I hope soon to read all that is worth reading in Italian, but that is a good deal.'

(5.) In England, 1881.—'I have notes to add to work in hand, *e.g.*, an edition of Van Linschoten for the Hakluyt Society. I have been lately reviewing for the Academy.'

(6.) From Italy, 1882.—'I am glad to hear that the Hippocrates will not be thought altogether useless. I am meanwhile collecting the Italian Saints' works, which form quite a small library, and which I hope you will not despise for the School.'

1882.—'I think that my stay here has done me much good, but, as usual, have been hampered by too much work. However, I see very plainly that I cannot work as I have

been used to do, and must take things easily. I have applied to be pensioned from July 10 next, when my furlough expires. . . .

'I have lately added much to my collection of materials about Bembo, and have read with infinite pleasure St. Catherine's (of Siena) letters and Dialogi.'

(7.) England, 1882, May.—'Is there a portrait of her? I got in Italy lately the fine Aldine folio of her letters, and it contains a striking woodcut picture of her. If you approve of it I will have it photo-lithographed. I dare say that many Positivists would be glad of a copy of this portrait.

'I feel better and hope to improve, and therefore begin to think of what I had better do. I have a great desire to study medicine, and graduate if possible. I think that both in Italy and here I could be of use to my poor neighbours if I were qualified.

'My resignation of the Service was accepted in very handsome terms.'

July, 1882.—'I hope to reprint a Latin version of the Aphorisms of Hippocrates.

'I think of standing for a purely honorary Professorship—that of Sanskrit at University College.'

To these quotations I add a series bearing on the question of Dr. Burnell's religious belief, which is not touched on, perhaps naturally enough all circumstances considered, in the ordinary notices, but which especially concerns us, and is the reason for this day's commemoration: we meet as Positivists, to do honour to a fellow believer.

In April, 1878, he writes: 'Since near ten years I have studied the Positivist books with increasing interest and conviction, and it has long been my wish to enter into communication with a society the aims of which fully have my sympathy.

'I shall be much gratified if you will allow me to send you a donation of £25 for the Positivist School, as a small token of good will'—(increased later to £50).

15th Charlemagne, 90 (June, 1878).—'Before your letter reached me I saw some brief notices of Max Müller's recent lectures, which seemed to me to indicate what your letter has fully made plain to me—his attempt to oppose Positivism by

arguments from Indian literature. I only regret this on account of the great influence he has in England. That he will succeed I cannot even imagine. It appears to me that, even allowing for the chronological confusion in the earlier Sanskrit literature, it is impossible to find more conclusive evidence of the great law discovered by Comte, and I hope some day to show this. . . .

‘I continually regret that heavy routine work has so fully occupied my time for the last eight years that I have had but little opportunity for such a study of Comte’s works as I could wish. I never allow a day to pass, however, without reading a few pages at least, and for many years I have found the result to be a steady increase of sympathy with Positivist aims; the philosophical part long ago convinced me, and has influenced all I have written on my confined subjects.’

2nd Moses, 91 (2nd January, 1879).—‘Dr. Nicholson has been here with me for a few days, and has kindly explained to me all that has lately occurred. I think that I should not miss a post, but should at once ask you to permit me, with all respect, to express my entire trust and confidence in your direction and guidance. It would not become so young a Positivist as I am to say any more, but I may hope that the present unfortunate differences will soon cease.’

19th Charlemagne, 91 (6th July, 1879).—‘Your “No. 3” is again a valuable contribution to the history of Positivism and to right thinking. A few will be led to Positivism as a religion by the *Philosophie Positive*, but I am not sure that they will be the best and most religious Positivists. The severe discipline of working through that splendid work, will, I think, conduce rather to intellectual development than to culture of the heart. Am I right in thinking so?’

‘Last Sunday I had to go to church . . . but what I dreaded as an unpleasant ordeal, I got through with little disturbance to my equanimity. I think this is a proof that I am now tolerably free from all theological prejudice, and I take comfort accordingly, for I think it is also a proof of advance and progress.’

6th Homer, 92 (3rd February, 1880).—‘I have nearly finished printing Adam Smith’s ‘History of Astronomy.’ I

shall send you about 200 copies for distribution. What other Positivist book would you recommend for printing next ?'

3rd Descartes, 93 (10th October, 1881).—'The more I read current literature, the more I find traces of the influence of our Faith, though the writers generally profess to be ignorant of it!

'I still hope to write, from a Positivist point of view, a history of the Portuguese in India, and a life of the great Renaissance scholar, Cardinal Bembo. . . .

'I was very much struck with your remarks to Nicholson about receiving the Sacrament of Maturity; I had long wished to ask for it from you, but I fear it would hardly do for me to ask in the condition I am now reduced to—my maturity is over before it arrived, and I can hardly hope for any future career.'

10th Descartes, 93 (17th October, 1881).—'I should indeed be glad to take the Sacrament of Maturity with Nicholson, *i.e.*, if I am still worthy.

'I am delighted to hear that the Catechism is to appear in Italian. I always have it with me.'

14th Dante, 94 (July 29th, 1882).—'This wretched weather makes me regret Italy, especially if I am to be a prisoner here; but I hope it will not be for long. I should much like to see you again, and to be able to be present at the Services; but I must be patient, or I shall deprive myself of that happiness for a long time.

'I am delighted to hear what has been and is to be done at the School. . . .

'As regards my reprints, please do what you think best. . . . During my dear mother's life, I thought it necessary to be somewhat reticent. But now, I am perfectly plain in my spoken opinions. . . . I find it would never do to discuss the matter here; if I once permitted it, it would never end, and would waste my time. So when I am attacked I hand a book to my assailant.'

These quotations, which extend over the four years of our correspondence, show what his attitude was to Positivism and the Positive Religion—one of complete acceptance, I may say.

We owe to him the two reprints :

(1.) Adam Smith's ' History of Astronomy.'

(2.) Hippocrates on ' Air, Waters, and Places.'

We owe to him also the portrait of Bouddha we have, and a liberal support during the period he belonged to us. The extracts show the purpose he kept always in sight of aiding the general cause in every way his health permitted.

I need add but few words. His life and work are sufficiently before you, and you can form a notion of what he was, of the nature of the services he rendered, as of those which, had he lived, he would have rendered under his special circumstances, for strong health and active vigour seemed scarcely possible for him. Had he taken the Sacrament of Maturity and survived it for some time, I make no doubt but that he would have given still more aid to us than he had done. That open testimony would have stimulated and ripened him; perhaps, in some respects, have altered his action and opinions.

As Positivists, in honouring our dead we subtract deficiencies. There is but little opening for this process in this case. Mr. Nicholson's judgment of him rests on more intimate knowledge of him, and I can fully accept it. I print it together with these remarks.

A slight excess of conciliation—a slight excess of adaptation to his social environment for the time being—an overdose perhaps of merely literary interest, all leading to an appearance of indifference to, or temporary suppression of, his deliberate convictions—if I mention these points it is that the estimate of him may gain in truthfulness, by being freed from exaggeration. In the direct assertion of his faith by a definite act he would have found a counteracting influence to any such passing defects. There is one other subject on which I thought him more gravely wrong. I speak of his feelings towards Eastern nations in general, of whom he spoke in terms of aversion which were very startling. Where there was so much agreement I thought it best to let his remarks pass without comment, confident that in time his opinions on such a point would change and be brought into harmony with his religious system. But that in so courteous and kindly a nature such feelings should exist, is a strong illustra-

tion of the peculiar difficulty of the contact between East and West.

Due allowance made for any such drawbacks, there remains an impression of a singularly pleasant kind, for which there is ample warrant in what we know of him, as appears in all that is written about him.

In a high degree unselfish, liberal, and modest, he gave his 'friendship very heartily and generously where he gave it.' His admiration for the achievements of others, his veneration for greatness or for saintliness, his kindness in helping wherever he could without thought of himself—these are traits which his letters and the notices of him bring out. All recognise the range and depth of his intellectual powers and acquirements, and I may add that the beautiful simplicity of his style would alone afford a presumption that his intellectual distinction was adequately supported by his moral nature. Both found a full expression by virtue of an energetic character. His courage and perseverance under the hard conditions of his later days speak forcibly to us all.

With deep regret we lose his companionship and aid.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

'Guernsey, Oct. 25, 1882.

'My personal knowledge of the late Dr. A. Burnell enables me to fill some of the blanks which Prof. Max Müller acknowledges in his obituary notice. He has given you the Sanskritist—the kind, helpful scholar; I would like to give you some idea of the man. I first knew Dr. Burnell in 1863, when (both of us newly arrived in India) we met at Calicut, where he was assistant magistrate. He took great interest in the language, the customs, the history of the Malyalam country; and his acquaintance with Sanskrit soon became so remarkable that he was known by the people of the country as 'Burnell Shastri.' I doubt not that his being first stationed at the place where Vasco de Gama landed—where the Portuguese and Dutch contested the dominion of India—led

him towards his historical studies. He was well acquainted with both their languages—indeed, he had a most remarkable talent for languages, European as well as Oriental—and he was thus able to study the original accounts of early travellers in the East. After some years' separation, I met him again when he was judge at Mangalore. I was then engaged in exploding the myths and sensational stories about Indian snakes, and reducing ophiology to a reasonable basis; he was, if I may mention his great work in the same breath with my humble efforts, engaged in clearing Sanskrit studies from the myths which encumbered them, and which delude the unwary. (Witness M. Fontaine's *Inde védique* and other works with more pretensions to Sanskrit scholarship.) We had thus a common principle of work, however different the direction. We afterwards found a stronger bond of union in harmony of religious opinion. Dr. Burnell first became acquainted with Positivism in 1867—and in no superficial way; the philosophical system had full influence over him. In the Preface to his edition of the *Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa*, he had considered some curious Vedic superstitions from this point of view. His religious sympathies, ripe for a later adhesion to the Positivist religion, had always been rather Catholic, while his family was of Jewish origin. I mention this because he never concealed it from his intimate friends, and disliked the practice, common among persons similarly circumstanced, of concealing their descent. He took great interest in the colony of Indian Jews at Cochin, and founded a scholarship in their school.

'Prof. Max Müller has given a sketch of his work as a scholar—hard, ungrateful, pioneer work, clearing away myths, and making ready the ground for future scholars; I will only speak of the works not mentioned in the obituary notice. When I returned to India in 1877, I found Dr. Burnell finishing a *Glossary of Indian Terms*, which he had undertaken in collaboration with Colonel Yule. This cost him great labour, and necessitated the formation of a special library at an immense expense. For this work he had read all the earlier Portuguese and English writers on India—above two hundred in number. The year before, he had made an archæological visit to Java, and there he met another devoted worker, Miss

North, engaged in her paintings of tropical plants and scenery. Owing to his Dutch connections, he had exceptional facilities for observing the condition of Java; and he returned to India more dissatisfied than ever with the English management of the country—vexed also at the treatment he received from the Madras Government, which, becoming somewhat awake to the eminence of Dr. Burnell, encouraged him in his great undertaking of cataloguing the Tanjore MSS., but had, not very considerably, doubled his official work by amalgamating the Tranquebar with the Tanjore court. The worry which this caused him precipitated the utter breakdown of his health. At the end of 1877 I had the pleasure of seeing him at Tanjore, at the time when Miss North passed through on her Indian travels. Dr. Burnell took the greatest pleasure in facilitating her work. In his encyclopædic knowledge, natural science had no small place; he knew the history of every Indian tree, and was enabled to procure for Miss North most of the sacred plants of India. The beautiful museum with which she has endowed Kew Gardens, contains many reminiscences of Tanjore as shown to her by Dr. Burnell.

‘In the meantime his labours on the Catalogue of the Tanjore MSS., were telling severely on his health; he was struggling to last out the twenty years of India which would earn him a competent retiring allowance, but this he never actually accomplished. In 1879 he was obliged to make a flying visit to England for medical advice, and he returned to his work rather shaken than improved. The Catalogue, which he often declared was killing him, was finished at last, though the errata and addenda were not published until the year following. He appreciated highly the recognition of his work by learned societies; but its recognition by the Indian Government was hardly of the kind to afford him much gratification. At the beginning of 1880, there was a distribution of Stars of India and Companionships of the Indian Empire; and he found himself included in the inferior category of notables. No sooner did he get the millstone of the Catalogue off his neck than he took to lighter work. He formed the generous idea of reprinting some of the rarer books of the Positivist Library: and he began with Adam Smith’s *History of Astronomy*, which was printed at Manga-

lore for the use of his co-religionists. He also began working at the translation of Manu for the Clarendon Press. In April he wrote—

“I am hard at work on Manu, but am now sure that it is not older than the fourth century A.D., though founded on much older materials. I have also nearly finished printing a small quarto (of some 150 pages), which has cost me much labour; it is a tentative list of books and MSS. relating to the history of the Portuguese in India proper. I only print fifteen copies, as I hope to bring out similar lists for the Dutch, French, and English. I hope *eventually* to make them good books. Historians nowadays neglect the most important materials through ignorance.”

‘Of this kind were all Dr. Burnell’s labours. He toiled that others after him might work with ease, content to devote himself to ungrateful tasks if only they were useful to others.

‘But his Indian career was soon to close. In the middle of 1880 he was attacked with partial paralysis, and was hurried away by his medical advisers. The voyage home did him good, and he went on to Carlsbad, where he improved, until an attack of pneumonia drove him to San Remo for the winter. He was hardly settled there than he began work again. In December he wrote, ‘What little work I am allowed to do is devoted to preparing Hippocrates on “Air, Water, and Situation,” with a Latin, French, and English version, for the Positivist Library.’ He made an excursion to the chief cities of Northern Italy in search of rare books, principally for this work. In March, 1881, he wrote to me: ‘The printing is going on, and I have nearly everything printed about Hippocrates to refer to—many a huge folio; how I shall get them to England I don’t know.’ While at Venice he found the Italian version of the letter from the King of Portugal to the King of Castille giving an account of the voyages and conquests in the East Indies. This rare letter he reprinted, with valuable notes, in a small presentation edition. He came over to England in the autumn of last year to visit his aged mother; I saw him then. He was to have come over this year in order to take the Sacrament of Maturity in the Church of Humanity on the occasion of his attaining his forty-second year. But he was, I believe, hurried over by the last illness of his mother, and, while staying on at the house where she had lived, he

was apparently seized by one of his old enemies, pneumonia. I knew nothing of his last illness; suffering for years past, he had become accustomed to pain and disease. He made light of them, and caused his friends the greatest anxiety by his lonely life. Always anxious to avoid spreading pain, he never used to tell me of his illnesses until they had passed, and thus I was surprised by the news of his death. It was a severe shock to learn through the common death-column of a newspaper that this bright life had passed away unperceived. For to great learning he joined a buoyancy of spirits which was astonishing to witness; he had the sweetest temper, the greatest eagerness to help, and the utmost modesty. He made light of his labours:—‘That I do anything at all is simply because I live a recluse life necessarily, and want amusement.’ And now that he is gone, I cannot but feel how unappreciated he lived, what a life of devotion has now closed, what a great mind has passed away. Truly of him it may be said—

‘Entro v’ è l’alta mente u’ sì profondo
Saver fu messo, che, se il vero è vero,
A veder tanto non surse il secondo.’

‘EDWARD NICHOLSON,
‘Surgeon-Major A.M.D.

‘P.S.—There is a good photograph of him taken last year by Lombardi, of 13, Pall Mall East.’

The commemorative tablet in the Church of Humanity in Chapel Street gives his name, the years of his birth and death, 52—94 (1840—1882), and the lines:

‘Entro v’ è l’alta mente u’ sì profondo
Saver fu messo.’

No. 10.]

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY,

OR

HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

A SERIAL.

1.—*THE CONVICTION FOR BLASPHEMY.*

A prosecution, conviction, and sentence for Blasphemy, being an event of an extraordinary character and apparently a reversion to the noxious proceedings of a past time, when the state of opinion was wholly different, demands the most careful and calm judgment at the hands of the adherents of the Religion of Humanity. Representing a nascent spiritual power, claiming in the future to guide the destinies of mankind by virtue of the known laws of social progress, it becomes a paramount duty for Positivists to form distinct conceptions as to the limits of State interference on matters of opinion and morals. Positivists are citizens in the highest sense of the word: ever ready to maintain order, to enforce obedience and respect to authority, but at the same time, watchful over the administration of the law, to guard against the tendency on the part of Government and tribunals to overstep the limits which are essential for the maintenance of liberty. More especially is this the case now with regard to spiritual liberty. We are prepared to take a leading part in condemning and resisting any real infringement, by legal decision or administrative usurpation, of the civic right to free opinion and its free expression. Therefore we published our condemnation of the expulsion of the Jesuits in France as a violation of the liberty of preaching and teaching. Therefore we expressed our disapprobation of the legal decision,*

* The Keogh Judgment.

which, uttered by a time-serving disreputable judge, sought to make the religious direction by Catholics in political matters unlawful, so as to render void a Parliamentary election.

For all schools of thought, for all forms of religion, philosophy, and politics, we claim the fullest liberty of opinion, of public statement, printed or spoken, however noxious the doctrines taught, however antiquated and contrary to scientific fact, however subversive their tendency may be to government, social order, or morality, provided that there is no incentive to breach of the peace or to violence, no actual indecency or obscenity. Grave and serious evils certainly follow upon such liberty. They cannot be denied or ignored. They can only be grappled with by discussion on their own ground, and by placing before mankind, in competition, a truer teaching and a nobler path. Repression is calculated to increase, not to stop the evil. Experience proves that it is so. Political repression throughout Europe has occasioned the most formidable secret conspiracies. The press prosecutions in England will beget, if they have not already begot, secret presses and hand-to-hand propaganda, infinitely more dangerous, and carried on by men who are misled, not bad, and whose energy and self-sacrifice is redoubled under the stimulus of persecution, and the increased popularity and influence they acquire. Not long ago an extreme political newspaper, being in extremities, did its utmost by violent language to provoke a prosecution. It was not prosecuted, and died a natural death. There are good grounds for believing that, in the present case, prosecution was wished for, if not actually courted.

The principles we lay down, which should regulate all proceedings in reference to opinion, are that—

(1.) There should be no legal protection for any opinion or institution, however venerable, or rooted in the hearts and convictions of men.

(2.) The State should secure order in temporal affairs by legal repression of violence, or incitements to violence and breach of the peace, and obscenity.

(3.) There should be allowed the utmost disorder in spiritual affairs.

Such disorder is unavoidable. Spiritual order cannot be created by political means or the employment of force ; but can only be achieved by society gradually, in a distant future, as the consequence of an ever increasing convergence of the opinions and religious convictions of mankind.

As Positivists we are engaged in the attempt to propagate a religion which is destined to supersede Christianity and all Theistic religions. We are deeply grateful to our fellow countrymen for the freedom which they have accorded to us, in spite of the law of blasphemy. We point to our advocacy of our own faith, not only as temperate but as sympathetic towards other religions and modes of thought. We insist that full liberty tends to similar results. Liberty, good example, and the natural repugnance of good men and women to unworthy means, are the true cure. We are prepared to allow, by law, the fullest licence for criticism, attack, vituperation, and ridicule of our religion and of all others, without any artificial protection by law. And our religion is as sacred to us as that of any Christian to him. It is alleged that the difference lies between street selling and other modes of publication. We cannot draw, nor is it practicable to draw, any such distinction. Offences against taste, hurting our feelings, exciting our disgust, should, like all parodies or burlesques on sacred and noble ideals, be left to the moral condemnation of society—more efficacious than any legal repression. We have no sympathy whatever with the method of attacking religion or opinions by the powerful weapon of ridicule. However repugnant attacks like those of Voltaire may be, we are prepared to resist any attempt to suppress them by penal law. Ridicule can hardly go further than Voltaire's writings. It may be coarser, more vulgar and brutal, more deliberately false, like Mr. Mallock's libel upon Positivism. But the baseness of the calumny, or the want of skill or literary merit, cannot make any difference. Nor can Voltaire's perfect language, sparkling with pungent sarcasm and matchless wit, make the difference. There is no line of demarcation between Voltaire and Mr. Foote. Both are attacks upon the Christian religion and its sacred conceptions by ridicule. Neither can the extent of circulation constitute the difference between legal and illegal publica-

tions. If it did, Voltaire's writings penetrated throughout Europe, and have continued to do so ever since. Neither can the fact of an appeal against Christianity being made to the poor and ignorant, doubtless thought harmful by Christians. Anyhow, we claim the liberty, and intend to preach the religion of Humanity, as superseding and superior to Christianity, among the poor and ignorant. While disapproving mere negation, criticism, and ridicule, we offer our most strenuous opposition to any attempt to put it down by force of law.

Deprecating the law and its use in general, we also condemn the proceedings taken upon the present occasion. Had the judge contented himself with a bare statement of the law he had to administer—had he contented himself with a fine and binding over the defendants, with the object of preventing the publication of the more offensive matter, little could have been said of such a use of such a law ; though, in our view, any repression is unwise and impolitic. But the language in which the prosecution was conducted, the law laid down by the judge, the harsh treatment of the defendants in refusing them bail, the theological bias shown in the passing sentence, and the extravagance of the sentences pronounced, and his refusal to adopt the recommendation of the jury to mercy, who took a wiser view of the case, make it imperative for us to declare that we regard the convictions and sentences as an outrageous theological persecution and violation of liberty. We therefore raise our voices in strongest condemnation of the judge. We call upon all citizens for action in this matter. We remind them that this is not the first prosecution or imprisonment for publication of books or papers, nor the first punishment for opinion. It would never have taken place at all, had it not been for the punishment and persecution of Mr. Bradlaugh by the House of Commons for his non-Christian opinions. In conclusion, we demand the remission of these sentences, and the abolition of the law of blasphemy. We do so in the name of Humanity, in the cause of religion and morality, of order and progress.

HENRY CROMPTON.

II.—*THE CHANNEL TUNNEL.*

Whether the Channel Tunnel is possible or not is a question for engineers—not for me here. All parties, favourable or adverse, seem to assume that it is practicable.

Will it answer as a commercial speculation? With this, again, we are not concerned. Neither are we concerned with the motives which have prompted the undertaking. It is a scheme of railway magnates, and, as such, with many an object of dislike. In all such cases there are mixed motives at work, and a great deal of the success already achieved in similar enterprises has been due to the mixture, the more selfish purpose supporting and animating, where a purer one would fail in strength.

The sole point I have to deal with is: Granted practicable and workable, ought the tunnel to be made?

A considerable body of opinion in England, represented by very eminent names, is adverse to the project. It is not denied that there are commercial advantages in the plan, nor is it denied that it is an object to improve the communication of the nations, more especially that between France and England. But it is urged that we have the good fortune to be an island, and should not throw it away. We have the streak of sea. Why not keep it between us and other nations? A quasi-impregnable frontier, why impair it? Let us keep from us all possible danger.

When pressed on this subject of danger, those adverse to the tunnel are not exactly agreed. Some insist directly on the danger to which we expose ourselves from the great military states of the Continent: France, or, in case of a new Franco-German war, Germany. Others rather avoid this point, and rest on the evil to England of a constant sense of insecurity. Even as it is, say they, we have known panic after panic: what would it be if we practically ceased to be an island? We should be in a permanent state of alarm; such is the nature of our people. Without discussing, then, the benefits or evils of the proposed scheme in itself, this inevitable result of it is sufficient in their eyes to make us reject it.

Such, I believe, is a correct estimate, very succinctly given, of the opposition to the tunnel, the strength of which lies no doubt in the strong national clinging to our isolation, from pride and from the desire of safety.

In contrast with the second form of the objection, some weight—it is always difficult in such cases to say how much—should attach to the trades union opinion, as expressed by the delegation to Paris. President Grévy was partly right, partly wrong, in what he said to it; right as far as any immediate result went; but there is a value in the fact that at any rate a large body of Englishmen are not hostile to the scheme. Their visit might make it evident to the French that the suspicion which is so powerful is not shared by the nation, but is rather the opinion of what is called society, generally a bad index of national feeling, as has been seen more than once of late years. On this point of English opinion my own belief is that it is much more in favour of the tunnel than is generally supposed; that the opposition comes from the speaking and writing classes, without any corresponding feeling in the large silent mass, which has been for the last fifty years slowly detaching itself from the policy of isolation and separation, slowly gravitating to a larger and more generous view of our national position; which would not shrink from the acceptance of greater obligations towards our compeers.

Be this as it may, and we are all confessedly rather devoid of any rational grounds for the calculation of the nation's dominant tendency, my object is to put forward the reasons why, as a Positivist, I think the submarine road which is to connect England and France should be accepted. These reasons may be stated in a very few words, as the objections have been, and also because the difficulty is after all not so much a matter of reason as of feeling. What is to be done then is to appeal to or awake another feeling.

The advantages are granted and admitted generally to be acceptable. Undue caution, suspicion, the remnants of long national contests and the natural product of the disturbance and mutual jealousies of the European States—in these lies our obstacle. Is not the time come for a less distrustful attitude? Are we for ever to assume that our civilised

neighbours are at any and every moment waiting to attack us? Would not a simple declaration in due form on the part of the two governments more immediately concerned that the road should not be used for warlike purposes be a sufficient guarantee?

It seems justifiable to question the reality of the danger, as it is to regret the timidity which is always evoking its phantom—a timidity which finds its sustenance in the consciousness of the dislike our selfish and encroaching conduct has made so general.

But I go farther, and, appealing to the nobler feelings, I would ask whether it would not be well for us if we acted under a greater sense of responsibility. Have we not abused our insular security, and, ourselves free from liability to war, been unscrupulous in carrying war wherever we saw fit? Would not our national history have been purer had we not had what we alone, it is justly remarked, claim, an impregnable frontier? In a measure exempt from the common lot of Humanity, we have not been duly observant of the common human duties. In a word, were there some mixture of danger in the project, it would not with me be a reason for its rejection. On the contrary, I would urge some sacrifice in the common cause. I would wish England not to deny her past, but to advance upon it, emerging from the closeness of intense nationalism into a freer atmosphere of community of interest with her co-equals in Europe, and more especially with her nearest and noblest co-equal, with whom all her historical antecedents have so intimately connected her. In the union of France and England lies the best hope of the world. A step towards that union will have been made when we renounce our suspicious bearing, and the enterprise which has suggested these remarks affords a good opportunity for such renunciation.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

No. 11.]

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY,
OR
HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

A SERIAL.

CENTRES OF SPIRITUAL ACTIVITY IN LONDON.

CHURCH OF HUMANITY (POSITIVIST SCHOOL).

[*Reprinted from the "Pall Mall Gazette," Thursday, January 17, 1884.*]

The second number of a series of articles on the above subject (see *Pall Mall Gazette* of Thursday, November 29, 1883) gave one aspect of Positivist action, having Newton Hall as its seat. It may be the shortest and easiest way of describing our centre in Chapel Street if I state, first, what we in Chapel Street have in common with Newton Hall, then what we have beyond it. I shall compress my statement as much as possible :—

First. What we have in common :—

1. Sunday discourses, given as a rule in the morning, at 11.15, ranging over all the subjects of human interest, all questions of social and personal duty.

2. We aim steadily at giving help in instruction wherever we have the means, and in this we should welcome any assistance that might be offered us for teaching, provided that such teaching were in sufficient conformity with the Positivist conception of intellectual training.

3. We have the Positivist library of the masterpieces of the human mind, the selection made by Auguste Comte, and limited for the present to the Western tradition, which includes the Jewish and the Islamic. The list is to be revised later.

4. We have in common the interest in practical politics, and we treat of them as occasion arises, holding that no such questions lie outside the attention of the new Church.

5. Commemoration of the greater dead, of our Founder in particular; the Festival of Humanity on New Year's Day; commemoration of All the Dead at the close of the year, and in leap year, of Holy Women; the social sacraments, the consecrations of each marked period of our existence, which form one essential constituent of our domestic worship; music and social meetings, together with other meetings, for quiet discussion or for mutual instruction.

6. The great Positivist formula and mottoes:—

LOVE FOR PRINCIPLE
AND ORDER FOR BASIS;
PROGRESS FOR END.

LIVE FOR OTHERS. LIVE OPENLY.

And we have the same practical rules. All with us is free, all teaching gratuitous; we meet on equal footing. We seek to avoid all mere negation, all aggression on the faiths around us, all aggressiveness of spirit, whilst making our position in regard to belief unmistakeably clear. Our ideal, our aspiration, is purely human; we wish to make religion and life once more co-extensive, in the same spirit as our Puritan ancestors, but on a surer basis.

The agreement then of the two bodies is considerable, and it is natural that it should be so. For it should be remembered that, over and above community of doctrine as drawn from its one source, the teachings of Comte, after a long period of gradual preparation we worked together for some years, in a lax, yet growing union, so far as concerned the common acceptance of the principles of our action. In our separation our past practice has been a great influence. The extent of agreement is such that, with due allowance for personal difference, on all social and political matters we might co-operate.*

So far as England is concerned, speaking broadly, we have

* I restore a passage omitted in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, the omission of which escaped me when I returned the proof, from my not comparing it with my MS.

as yet practically co-operated, as I have frequently acknowledged. We might, perhaps, now make it clear to the world outside that, within the above limits, we are practically at one in our actions, and on fitting occasions are ready to work together. Further, in regard to all our co-religionists in other countries, we are agreed in our wish for union and such concert as is possible.

Secondly. Our difference:—what we have beyond Newton Hall:—

Those who come to Chapel Street find a service—music, and invocation, readings or lessons, prayers, an address or sermon, all in fact, so far as can be, of what they usually associate with religion or worship—the beginnings of a ritual with the avowal of its deliberate adoption, with the wish gradually and prudently to enlarge it. It has been so for many years, it was so in principle with the acceptance and approval of the leaders among those who now do not use it. For our object is to preach a religion, to found a Church which may extend to all nations, to set forth the central truth of such religion and Church, to proclaim Humanity to the world, and, in the words of Comte, to reorganize by her systematic worship. However weak we may be, however early the period, however inopportune the effort may seem, we are bold to take our stand in presence of the mediæval Catholic Church with all its offshoots, of which the Episcopal Church of England is the most important, confronting in common with that Church the irreligion, indiscipline, and, worse than either, the indifference of our time, and averring that, as a modern Catholic Church, we make the same claims as our mediæval predecessor to the spiritual direction of mankind, that we seek to substitute ourselves for it, that we continue its work, its teaching, its training, its discipline, its aspiration after universality, its desire for the unity of mankind, its noble efforts to shelter from suffering, to console in sorrow. We would lose no part of the spiritual heritage it has left us, and a common worship is an essential part of that heritage. The Christian Church took over much from the religious system which preceded it. We would do the same in our turn, with due revision.

Mindful of our own and our country's religious past, we

connect ourselves with it as much as we can and with the religious feeling of those around us. As their earlier convictions fail them, we offer them sounder convictions, leaving room for the expression of their earlier feelings, and urging them to a similar discipline for their habits.

Faithful to the uttermost of our power to the teaching of Comte, and accepting it on this point with the fullest assent, we inaugurate (the rudimentary form need not be a difficulty to the thoughtful, or to the Christian who calls to mind his own past) the systematic worship to which he attached so much importance. Education is a great thing, but in the full sense of the term within its common limit, it is the business of the family, aided in the higher part of instruction by the priesthood, and so far a function of the Church. There are two other functions of a Church, the culture of feeling and the discipline of habits. The first is directly the object of worship, and the ordinary form of worship has, in all our more immediate past, given an opportunity for the inculcation of right habits.

Again, following Comte's express direction, in the different method we adopt we aim at a more direct result than is attainable by any teaching. If we can win to the acceptance of Humanity as the supreme source of obligation, to the acceptance consequently, through gratitude and love, of her service, we think that those who are so won will qualify themselves as her servants, so far as it is in their power, and that even intellectually, where circumstances admit. We think, that is, that their love will lead them to the faith, as increasing their power of service. Our aim being to spread a religion, we look to the conditions which prevail in England and out of England, and not in London merely. Some simple central truth around which all feeling and thought and action may condense, and from which men can work outwards—such truth being brought home by the emotions—such is the need as far as our judgment goes; and the experience of the past warrants our judgment. Nor are we without warrant in the present. In all the other English centres but Newton Hall—in London, in Liverpool, in Birmingham, Newcastle, and Leicester—the method adopted in Chapel Street is, with ore or less completeness, adopted.

In the busy yet dreary scepticism of London, with all its literary, artistic, and scientific distractions, with its social and political excitement, another direction may be given to Positivist action, and with more immediate success. But with other surroundings those to whom we speak of a new religion ask for something which they can recognise as such. And we come to the same conclusion from another point of view. Comte looks to women as his best adherents, as the noblest field for the growth of a new faith in its early days, as its firmest support and truest members throughout all time. In our work we have to address adult women whose instruction—not education—is very generally deficient, and who cannot, if they would, remedy the deficiency, or but very partially. It is through the feelings and habits that they must come to us, not through systematic instruction. So, again, with the other great portion of the spiritual power, the proletariat. A real propagation, in short, must be through hope and desire, not through intellectual conviction. As intellectual restlessness, doubt, and negation grow more and more thorough and more disquieting, we would offer to those who feel the pressure, while they cannot go back to their old belief, the quiet repose of weekly meetings in which their moral culture of themselves through veneration and service may have the aid of a common expression; where they may recur to practices which have fallen into disuse, and so be led to reintroduce them into their private life.

Such throughout has been my aim. A disciple of Comte, by him nominated for the priesthood, exercising the priestly office by the necessity of the case—for a nascent Church demands its exercise not less than a Church which has existed for centuries,—I have ever kept in view the obligations of such priesthood, the simplest and most elementary of which is to proclaim the power in whose name it acts. It is not open to a new religion to entertain the question of opportuneness in regard to such proclamation. It is conceded that it is but a question of time. We have thought that we are bound to make our own time. In a word, with the same ideal, the same ultimate goal, the two groups adopt a different method. Our choice in Chapel Street is determined by the religious tradition of the past, by the inevitable

170 CENTRES OF SPIRITUAL ACTIVITY IN LONDON.

advance of the future in the direction chosen, by the wants of the present ; it is sanctioned by the teaching of Auguste Comte—his direct teaching on this cardinal point—which teaching we accept in gratitude and veneration, in dutiful submission to our common Master, in the confidence derived from long experience.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

55 PALACE GARDENS TERRACE, W.

19 CHAPEL STREET,

LAMB'S CONDUIT STREET, W.C.

No. 12.]

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY,
OR
HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

A SERIAL.

In No. 10 of this serial two subjects were treated, one, the Conviction for Blasphemy, by Mr. H. Crompton, the second, the Channel Tunnel, by myself. The present number treats of two subjects which are in direct connection with the first of the above-named. For all three concern the disabilities which by existing arrangements attach to English citizens solely in consequence of their disagreement with the ruling belief. With regard to all three the contention is in principle the same. All such disabilities should disappear.

I.—BURIALS.

This question was near its settlement lately, and might so easily have been settled. The change of one small conjunction was all that was wanted. But the Government lacked nerve; its special organ was wanting in nobleness; the then Archbishop was indisposed to the fulness of concession which would have closed the controversy. So it remains a source of bitterness.

It is so simple a matter. As the State sees that all who are born under its jurisdiction have their birth acknowledged without any question of opinion; as it provides a legal sanction for all marriages without reference to opinion; as it enforces the registration of all deaths; so it would seem but natural that it should take care for the burial of all its citizens, sanctioning the mode each family adopted, on the sole condition that it did not disturb public order. It might insist that where there is only a churchyard available, as is the case in country districts, the churchyard should be open equally to all parishioners on this sole condition. The sub-

stitution of the cemetery for the churchyard with all its memories seems deplorable when it is possible to avoid it. Where the cemetery is unavoidable, there should be no restraint in the form of burial, if orderly. There should be no requirement of any religious service opposed to all the convictions of the person buried, painful therefore by its unreality and untruth to all survivors. Nor, again, should there be any enforcement of silence as a sign of inferiority, as an assertion of the supremacy of one belief. With a police control to guard against any infringement of order, all should be on an equal footing.

As Positivists, the grievance of the present wretched system presses on us less than on most. For our practice is to commit our dead to their graves with some very simple farewell, whilst three weeks later, in our temples, or their substitutes, we hold the funeral service. But there are others who may feel the pressure more, and in the common interest it is desirable to remove it.

As English citizens, anxious to fulfil all the duties of such citizenship, and not averse to bearing its burdens, even when we most strongly object to the conduct which makes them heavier, we claim that the measure of our citizenship be in no way cut short because of certain opinions we hold—and the claim we make for ourselves we make for all, however much we may dissent from them—we make it with the more confidence, inasmuch as its concession is but the expression of that religious liberty which we are so forward to proclaim as the birthright of Englishmen, but which is not complete while any disabilities or insults attach by law to religious convictions.

Speaking lastly in the name of Humanity, I urge on all who profess the dominant faith, the believers in theology under any of its forms, and more especially on the clergy of all denominations, the timely acceptance of the larger, more charitable attitude which would quench all the irritation on this point. I feel certain that numbers of the clergy would be glad were its occasion removed. Few, if any, laymen or clergy can doubt what will be the final issue of the struggle which a timid unwisdom has left undecided. They have seen enough of late years to know what course all such disputes

follow. No form of religious belief, theological or human, can afford to maintain, much less increase, its exclusiveness; all forms must rely on their own positive strength, not on bearing down others. The social influences of our time are removing all barriers to the free formation, expression, or discussion of convictions. The sense of a common origin, a common purpose, a common lot, is being borne in on us from all sides, despite all the discord which exists. Opposition to this beautiful tendency, on the part of any theological organization, is as unworthy as it is in vain. Would it not exercise a salutary influence on all our disputes during life, if by the measure of justice for which I plead it were made clear that in death they ended, that there all met as human beings in one common and equal repose?

II.—OATHS.

With regard to oaths again, the settlement is well-nigh complete; the question is reduced to the narrowest compass, one personal complication alone retarding the sure and final decision in favour of liberty. In all the ordinary transactions of life, as in the regular administration of justice, an end has been put to controversy. Even in regard to Parliament great progress has been made. The Dissenter and the Jew have had their way, There remain only those who reject theological belief. And the action of the House of Commons towards them is declared unconstitutional by the leading statesman of the day. Under such conditions, one may well say that the final decision is certain to be in favour of liberty.

The Positivist has no objection on principle to oaths. In common with all thoughtful men he may object to their lavish use, their degradation by carelessness. Otherwise all that concerns him is the form of words in which the oath is expressed. It is for the Christian, in particular for the Protestant Christian, whose faith rests on an infallible book, to reconcile the common practice with the statements of that

book, so decidedly adverse to all oaths. The Quakers alone have been logical in this respect, as in many others. The Positivist sees in oaths merely an institution of society which experience has been thought to warrant, which has been long upheld, to which therefore he is inclined to accord a certain presumptive value. So long as the government of the country imposes them he would obey, claiming only that as others, say the Jew, the Musalman, or the Chinese, he too may have the oath administered in the form which suits his religious belief. Whilst this is not allowed it is natural to prefer the affirmation. I add that by the nature of his belief, by its relative character, the Positivist might take oaths in the form imposed by law, looking to the essential meaning of the practice, not to particular words. But it is better if the words accord with his faith. It is curious how incapable men are of putting themselves in an opponent's place, how unable they are to see that men who set aside all theological belief cannot commit blasphemy against the object of such belief, whose existence they do not recognise; and may well therefore consider themselves entitled to disregard the words which assert it. Far from seeing this, men of ordinary minds not only scatter freely the charge of blasphemy, but are persuaded that those against whom they bring it consider themselves obnoxious to it, accept it, and are conscious of wrong-doing in this particular respect. So far in passing.

We can go further and even sympathise with those, a more or less numerous body in Parliament, who on serious religious grounds object to the entire disappearance of the oath. Under the conditions above stated, we might, with them, wish for its retention, as opposed to an affirmation, reserving this last for those who cannot consent to the stronger form. The special formula used is not very happily chosen, as it pledges members to a particular government, which by their position they might be called to change. The House of Commons may conceivably, I mean, have again, as once before, to set aside the monarchy. And in the uncertainty of the future on all such questions, as also judging by the later experience of Europe, promissory oaths are unadvisable. But the solemn pledge of each member to the careful discharge of the obligations of his membership—the

recognition of a special duty—might well take the form of an oath when there was no insuperable objection in the religious creed.

In the actual difficulty it seems but too clear that the conduct of the House of Commons is determined by the strong dislike felt against one individual. It is, in fact, a privilege which is enacted, and which the majority is resolved to retain as long as it can. It is, however, no part of my purpose to discuss this determination any more than to discuss the course taken by Mr. Bradlaugh to enforce his own and his constituents' just claim that he should sit as Member for Northampton. All embarrassment, I may remark in passing, would be at end, were it but allowed that in such matters the constituencies are supreme, the representative body their delegate, and consequently that it rests with the former to decide in the last resort who shall speak for them. It is hardly necessary here to touch on any possible exception, such as the choice by a constituency of an ordinary criminal.

No unpopularity of Mr. Bradlaugh should make us hesitate in allowing the justice of his claim, or in recognising that he is, under much abuse and hatred, doing real service in helping to destroy this last remnant of civil disabilities on the score of religious opinion. His cause will be seen increasingly to be the common cause of all the constituencies in the first place, then of all English citizens whatever.

I have to add something more. We Positivists owe Mr. Bradlaugh an apology for an unjust attack. That attack was to the effect that Mr. Bradlaugh was a type of the Darwinian section of the Liberal party. The principles of this section are stated to be as follows: 'To them the key of history in the past and of policy in the future is the survival of the fittest in the selfish struggle for material existence. . . . They become frantic with disgust if the Government of their country should be found supporting a weak race against a strong one. . . . The justice or injustice of the struggle has nothing to do with the matter . . . &c. In both lines of policy there is a tendency to fatalism, and even cowardice, which justifies the remark—again to borrow from Mr. Arnold—that the Darwinians are wanting in *civil courage*.'

(Extracts from an address on England and Egypt, by Mr. Fossett Lock.)

It is no business of mine to say a word here about the Darwinian theory, or its supporters. Whether it and they are justly described, or not, it is certain that the description given above does not apply to Mr. Bradlaugh—that he is no Darwinian, if Darwinian bears such meaning. He may have been right or wrong in his political advocacy, but he has not been wanting in civil courage; he has not recoiled through cowardice from the weaker cause. Quite the contrary. Various causes, health, and other work, have delayed this expression of my opinion; I regret that I bear so tardy a testimony; but it is sincere, full, and uncompromising—the discharge of a just debt to an open and consistent opponent.

Returning to the main subject, what I have said on Burials is applicable to Oaths. In regard to them, all English citizens, whatever their religious belief, should be placed on the same footing of perfect freedom. The edifice of religious liberty wants but little to complete it. It has been built with much effort by a long succession of generations. The few remaining additions might in our own generation be easily made. Two of them are dealt with in this paper; a third—I believe the final one—is left. It is the removal from the Statute Book of all laws alien to the completest equality, all laws repressive of freedom of opinion. On no excuse should any such be allowed to remain, for they have a power in them for evil. As the true issues become more visible from under all the superficial broil, feeling will grow hotter, and it will be well beforehand to leave it no legal arms on one side or the other.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

55 PALACE GARDENS TERRACE, LONDON, W.

4 Aristotle, 96 (29 February, 1884.)

No. 13.]

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY,
OR
HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

A SERIAL.

THE LABOUR QUESTION.

(A reprint of a tract issued in 1861.)

I.—A LETTER FROM A FRENCH WORKING MAN ON THE
PRESENT STRIKE.

II.—A REPORT ON THE LABOUR QUESTION PRESENTED TO
THE POSITIVIST SOCIETY.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH.

The translation is not mine, but I take the full responsibility of it.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

SOUTH FIELDS, WANDSWORTH,
17 Gutenberg, 73 (Thursday, August 29, 1861.)

I.—A LETTER FROM A FRENCH WORKING MAN ON THE PRESENT
STRIKE.

ORDER AND PROGRESS.

DEAR AND HONOURED CONFRERE,—I am indebted to the kind attention of Mr. Winstanley for my knowledge of the new aspect which the strike of the London workmen has assumed. The very existence of this strike was previously unknown to me, as our newspapers preserve a systematic,

N

and probably concerted, silence on the subject. I am extremely grateful to our friend for having brought to my knowledge a fact of such high importance,—the transformation, namely, of a certain number of workmen into the defenders and voluntary guardians of the moral and social ties yet remaining between them and their employers. Their intention, clearly stated, to maintain the custom of working *by the day*, convinces me that, though they may not possess an exact knowledge of all the reasons in favour of their tendencies, they are not without an admirable sentiment of them.

I avail myself of this opportunity to express my deep regret that they are unacquainted with the teachings of Auguste Comte, at once so noble and so sympathetic, for I cannot doubt that they would have accepted them, since, of their own accord, they have entered upon the path to which they lead. You are better placed than any of us, and are also both able and worthy, to appreciate this interesting state of affairs. To you, then, I address myself, in the name of the French Positivists, begging you to let us know in what way we can best assist our brother-workmen in England; and we further beg you to express to them our fraternal sympathy, and offer to them a small subscription, the special object of which is to evidence the sincerity of our feelings. To us it is a most encouraging sight to see men, progressive without being revolutionary, undertake, without in any degree losing their progressive character, the defence of the moral and social institutions established by our forefathers and sanctioned by long experience. It impresses me with the conviction that these men feel their strength, and they prove that they feel it by using it with prudence and moderation. If to these qualities they add that of perseverance, so general in England, they have all the characteristics of a real practical power, to which the truth may and ought to be spoken. It is the belief that such is the case which has determined me to beg you to lay before them the following social considerations upon the relations of workmen and employers,—considerations which may, I think, throw some light upon the question of strikes, and tend to limit, or rather
te, their action. Hitherto, strikes have inevitably

had the character of a sort of collective egotism ; they have been employed by men possessing a certain amount of strength and using it to gain more strength,—coalescing, the better to defend their interests. As a means of developing their strength such a course was unexceptionable, but the power, when developed, must, like every other power, be moralised, that is, enlisted in the service of social sentiments, so as to defend the interests of those who are, as yet, not strong enough to defend themselves. Besides this question of duty, a most powerful means of increasing strength gained is to show that we have enough and to spare, by never losing sight of generous sentiments in our greatest exercise of strength, and never putting forward claims that are not scrupulously just.

I rejoice that in this respect the strike of the London workmen, like that which recently took place in Belgium, has perfectly fulfilled all the conditions which make such struggles legitimate ; that is to say, that, having a just cause to defend, they have shown no tendency to excess in their demands. But this defensive warfare is still a warfare, and, like all others, though less obviously, it affects the existence of numbers of innocent human beings, impoverishes society, and, especially, calls forth evil passions ; and all this without a possibility of any definite result capable of modifying the final issue. After all, it is but the application of material force to questions of a moral and social nature.

For all these reasons, I cannot exaggerate the necessity of the greatest prudence, the utmost goodwill and moderation ; for, if it is essential to avoid all weakness, it is even more so to avoid all passion. Further, strikes are not the only means at our disposal to re-establish the relations which have been suspended, and even to solve the hard problem of these modern times. That problem is, to secure the co-operation—a co-operation constantly increasing in activity and willingness—of all the members of society, in order to increase the amount of comfort within the reach of each member, at the same time that it increases, in an equal proportion, his liberty. This problem the Positivist organisation alone has shown itself able to solve, and, without entering upon any philosophical dissertations, which would be beyond

my powers, it is possible even now to show its superiority, by virtue of its power of simplifying the problem. For instance, it at once disposes of one extraordinary error which has long thrown a mist over all discussions bearing on the relations between employers and workmen—I mean that belief, common to both parties, that they are the natural enemies one of the other, having, by the nature of the case, conflicting interests. All share this error in a greater or lesser degree; it arises from both parties looking at a question of such intense general interest, not as they should do, even if the question were a personal one, from the social point of view, but, at best, from the point of view of their own class. This mistake in principle has been the cause of a singular phenomenon. Interests, practically the same, are regarded as excluding, and diametrically opposed to, one another. Such, however, is far from being the fact. The interests of the workmen are no more at variance with those of the employer than were the interests of the soldiers of a conquering army, in the days when conquest was legitimate, at variance with those of their chiefs. What was the end each able-bodied man proposed to himself in the heroic days? Was it not to ensure for his country, each in his generation, the greatest amount of comfort and security possible? And what should all able-bodied men propose to themselves in these industrial and peaceful days? The very same problem, only with an extension unknown before, to secure the greatest sum of well-being and security; first, to the Western family of nations, and gradually to the whole of the great human family. Happier than our forefathers in this, that, while they were obliged to destroy, in order to attain their object, we, on the contrary, are only obliged to produce; and that we have inherited from them an immense mass of capital, material, intellectual, and moral, which, when we take the trouble to use it rationally, will enable us to perform our task, not merely with ease, but with positive pleasure, so far as we are well disposed. Yet, with all these advantages, we are less successful in our action than our forefathers were, comparatively speaking. The reason is, that neither in intellect nor in heart have we risen to a level with our duties, although these duties are not so hard as theirs were, as is

evident from the respective mottoes, that of the olden time being, 'To die for our country,' while that of the modern is, 'To live for others.' The duty of both was to protect the weak by the exertions of the strong. The ancients performed their duty of protecting by war; we should effect this protection by our labour. And, if hitherto this protection has been so insufficient, it is not labour that is in fault. The fact is, that our service has not been willing, and therefore society has been obliged to support, at our expense, an army of overlookers, whose sole business it is to secure, by the aid of legal checks, what should be given freely. The plain statement of this fact is sufficient to show its importance and the fatal influence it exerts over our lives. There are just two points to which I would draw attention.

First, that our forefathers, not having this army of overlookers to pay for enforcing their co-operation, had the whole of the profits of their undertakings available in the service of their country.

Secondly, that this absence of voluntary co-operation on the part of the producers, workmen and employers alike, is the chief source of the evils which weigh down the most industrious part of the population. For the employers, obliged to take from their returns the money wherewith to pay this innumerable host of agents, overlookers, &c., who are kept to ensure their own co-operation, as well as that of the workmen, are no longer in a position to give sufficient wages: thence come strikes, which in this case only aggravate the evil. There can and will be but one remedy for it—a return to voluntary co-operation on the part of all the producers. It is the only way to place the employers in a position gradually to raise the rate of wages, so as at length to enable the workman to leave his wife in his home, there to bring forth fresh workmen, the sole, but most valuable, production which can come only from her. On their side, the workmen must avoid all that checks the production of things useful, and even merely agreeable, so long as it is not evident that the supply is greater than the demand.

The limits of a letter are very narrow to treat of such questions, but there is still another point on which I desire to say a few words.

Listen to the economists, and it would appear that they believe, in their simplicity, that society has been, from time immemorial, divided into two classes—consumers and producers. Is this their belief? I know not. Whether it be or no, they have repeated it in every possible form; and one of their favourite forms is this: When there is a dearth of consumers, industry suffers, is overstocked, comes to a standstill. What is the meaning of all this? Are not all producers, rich or poor, permanent consumers? Are not all the weak, for whom the strong labour, also permanent consumers? the constituents which make up what we call society, an immense body, composed of the weak and the strong, the strong devoting themselves especially to producing, the weak to preserving the various productions of the strong,—thus working, they too, after their own fashion, and being in a sense also producers. Many animals, even, find their place in the one class or the other. So that the most insignificant being, with nothing to give in return for the services he receives but at best a little gratitude—the noble horse, the faithful and devoted dog—the weakest of men cultivating his good feelings in the hope of rendering himself more worthy of the benefits he receives; the labourer, toiling in his task of producing food; the artisan, skilled in the manufactures which make life comfortable; the poet, who by his genius gives us the highest pleasures of life; the philosopher, whose studies and moral system have moulded our social existence,—all these are voluntary producers, and, therefore, more or less worthy consumers. It is for them that we must secure well-being and security. There is no higher aim for our exertions, and each of us may well spend in that service all his powers, of heart, of mind, and body, without any fear of going beyond the mark. But, over and above this, so careful is society, that rather than run the risk of leaving a single man of genius to be borne down by the daily cares of life, it will and does secure in excess both well-being and security to a great number of its members, reserving to itself the right of calling them to order should they abuse the gift.

I have named a very respectable list of consumers: neither on the score of numbers nor of variety can we complain of it, and the simplest good sense will convince us that we have no

need to look for more. But where and who are those special consumers upon whom so high a value is set, whose absence, we are told, paralyses industry? How can they possibly serve us if they are not producers? What possible return can they make for our produce? Let us examine the question a little—all the more that they seem to court observation.

In all times there have been dishonest men, but, in our time, the catholic and feudal system having passed away, the Positivist system not having as yet taken its place as the guide and director of men's activity, the number is greater than ever. Thus it has often happened that unscrupulous manufacturers and dealers, having stocked the market with inferior, useless, or even positively injurious articles, have profited by the ignorance of the buyers to draw to themselves the capital which should have been employed in honourable commerce or useful industry. Meanwhile, the buyers are ruined by the worthlessness of the articles in which they have invested, and soon both bad and good commodities are left upon the hands of the merchants; for this reason, that the capital, having been unwisely expended, is unproductive, and the buyers are obliged to wait for fresh capital before they can reappear as purchasers. The economists, perceiving this, and not attempting to discover the true reason of it, exclaim that there is a dearth of consumers, when their cry should be, 'There is a dearth of good articles, and of the capital which has been expended in the purchase of worthless ones.'

So long as this language was confined to the economists, the danger was unperceived; but when the public had adopted it also, the parasites of society, whose best chance is in disorder, exaggerated the language held by the public, and no means, however extravagant, however mean, however violent, have been left untried to secure consumers. I have no wish to stir up this mud to pick out some of their arguments. They are only too well known. It is better to remedy the evil when once its nature is understood.

I would say to the manufacturer and the shopkeeper, 'Return to upright dealing, for if you impoverish those who buy your goods, you dry up the sources of your own prosperity.' I would say to the workmen, 'The evil I speak of is greater than is supposed, but strikes are powerless to meet

it. The only efficient remedy is to substitute positive opinions for the ridiculous sophisms which represent the want of consumers as the root of the evil.'

Those who can speak and act uprightly have the remedy in their own hands: let them apply it and the evil will be overcome.

For myself, if I can, however feeble, contribute to such a result, one of my dearest hopes will be fulfilled.

Accept, my dear Confrère, the expression of my respect and fraternal devotion,

FABIEN MAGNIN,
Working Engineer,
President of the Positivist Society,
16 Passage Feuillet, Paris.

2 Gutenberg, 73 (14 August, 1861).
RICHARD CONGREVE, Esq.

II.—*A REPORT ON THE LABOUR QUESTION PRESENTED TO THE POSITIVIST SOCIETY.*

PROGRAM.

In the eye of the Positivist Society, the normal organisation of industry in modern society requires, as a first step, the reconstruction of opinions, based upon the free adoption of a universal doctrine fitted to reform general education, and to call into existence throughout the West a new spiritual authority, the natural arbitrator in industrial conflicts. The serious practical disturbances lately caused in France by a metaphysical tendency to direct by law that which ought above all to be regulated by morality, have given a confirmation to this our fundamental conviction. But they have also drawn our attention to some immediate measures which, without going to the root of the question, may contribute to lead men to wait for, and even to prepare, the only radical solution,—a solution which can only be decisively applied after the lapse of a generation.

The better to secure a practical character for such a preliminary examination, I chose among our members a committee, composed exclusively of working men, named at

the end of March. This committee first gave a verbal account of the main results of its labours at our meeting of the 19th of April. To explain its measures more fully, it read, on the 24th of May, the following memorable Report, in which the true mechanism of industry is better appreciated in a few pages than in all the volumes devoted to the pretended science of political economy.

In voting, after a mature discussion, the publication of this report, the Positivist Society proclaims to the public that it fully adopts the important measures proposed, and, above all, the lucid principles which are the basis of these measures.

AUGUSTE COMTE,

Author of the 'System of Positive Philosophy';
Founder and President of the Positivist Society,
10 Rue Monsieur-le-Prince.

PARIS, Monday, 5th June, 1848.

REPORT.

If we rightly understand our commission, it resolves itself into an answer to the two following questions:—Are there any legislative measures which may enable the working classes to pass more easily through the period which must elapse before the reform in opinions, feelings, and habits shall admit of a reform in institutions? And, if there are such measures, what are they?

There are some measures to be taken; we will try to point out some of them, on a correct view of the actual situation.

A careful observation of industrial life soon shows us that the greater number of the evils which disturb it are due to the want of foresight in the management of labour and public wealth. This is not the only cause, but, among those which allow of the intervention of the legislator, it seems to us to deserve most particular attention: first, because of the disturbances it occasions in labour, and especially because it re-acts deplorably on the minds of men, by giving rise to prejudices which tend to perpetuate the evil by preventing its true causes from being discerned.

Thus, evident though it be that there must always be work, since there are always wants to be satisfied, and materials to be procured, or to be employed for the satisfac-

tion of these wants, yet we hear it said that there is no work, and this at times when the wants which can only be satisfied by the productions of labour press most heavily. There is a confusion here between accidental interruptions, resulting from want of foresight or skill in the direction of labour, and an absolute want of work, from which it is inferred that we are over-peopled. At other times, it is said that there are too many producers, too few consumers. The legitimate inference should be, that we are too thinly peopled; but this contradiction is too striking, and, therefore, it is avoided by saying that those who have the means should consume more and produce nothing, and in this way give an impetus to labour. It is forgotten that the act called labour cannot be paid by the act called consumption, and that it is only useful labour that can pay for the discharge of any office, useful or otherwise.

On hearing such language, one is tempted to believe that men have forgotten what labour is. Labour is the bringing into action of all the wealth, and natural or artificial powers of Humanity, with the object of satisfying all its wants. What, then, is required to create a demand for labour? As we have already said, first, there must be wants to be satisfied; there is no immediate danger of their ceasing; and, for ourselves, in spite of the economists, we do not think that there is a dearth of consumers. Consumption is a fact which depends on no man's will; all producers are consumers; this is a sufficient justification of labour. Next, we need materials; these are not wanting, since the producers complain of a glut. And if they were wanting (which can only happen in particular circumstances, and from want of foresight) there would be no want of work: on the contrary, as these materials are the result of labour, the earth, men's arms, and intelligence, would only wait to be set to work.

But, it will be said, it is not enough to have wants and materials, we must also have capital, in order to undertake works. True, but the capital exists, for we continue to live; only when labour is at a standstill capital is unproductively employed, instead of being made, by work, to reproduce itself for the future. The putting any work in motion never costs so much as a mendicity society, a hospital, or a prison, with

all their necessary appendages, which bring in nothing, whereas the work would have increased the general wealth. These are, nevertheless, the only remedies which have been proposed to meet the evils occasioned, for the most part, by want of foresight, strengthened by prejudice.

Want of foresight, and especially want of social foresight, is as injurious to the preservation of wealth as it is to its production. We give one example:—In the years of great abundance the wine-growers either lose a portion of their productions, or are ruined by the increase of expense. In either case society must lose; in one case the produce, in the other the activity of the producer, who is paralysed unless assisted.

To those who say that it is not enough to produce, that buyers must also be found, we reply that if an article does not sell, it is because it has no value; in that case it ought not to have been produced. Neither the public wealth, nor the labour of the workers, the most precious part of that wealth, ought to be wasted. Or it may be that those to whom the products in question are offered are too poor to buy them. If they are poor, it is because they have been left without work, or because they have not received the value of their work. It will be said that we cannot foresee everything; true, and therefore it is that, although we would urge the manufacturers, or, in other words, those specially interested in the public wealth, to exercise as much foresight as possible, it is not from them that we seek the remedy. We shall be told that if there are poor, it is because they are idle. We reply that idleness must be the exception, activity the rule!

Were it otherwise, we should be led to ask, is life a fiction? In fact, as we can only live by activity, if idleness were the rule, it would be difficult to account for life. But, as it is not at all so, we conclude that activity is the rule, idleness the exception. Besides, if, in thought, we place idleness among the wants to be satisfied (and we satisfy wants which have quite as little claim), it will be seen that it is an additional reason for giving work to those who are willing to work.

It is well to observe, also, that idleness is not peculiar to the working classes.

Do what we will, we cannot escape from the accusation of want of foresight, as well social as individual ; volumes might be written on the evils it has caused, aided as it is by the prejudices to which it has given rise. But an appeal to common sense will be more effectual. We will quote, on this subject, the reply made by a workman to the commissioners appointed to inquire into the position of the labouring classes. They told him that his labour was a commodity, on the same footing with other commodities, and that he was free to dispose of it on fair terms.

‘And yet,’ replied the workman, ‘it has a character of its own, because if ordinary commodities are not sold one day, they are another ; whereas if I do not sell my labour, it is lost for all the world and for me ; and as the existence of society depends on the results of labour, society is the poorer by the value of what I might have been able to produce.’ This reply is worth all your statistics ; and if it were followed out in all its consequences, it would be enough to destroy the existing prejudices.

Finally, it will be urged as an objection, that it is easy to criticise industrial life, but it is not so easy to regulate it, and that the employers of industry do not appear to be in a state to do this, although they may have the will. True ; but although they may help in their degree, we believe that the task requires the whole power of the state, and the united wisdom of the whole of society even though it is not a question of a thorough and definitive organisation, but only, as we said at the beginning, of some measures of primary necessity.

Before we enter on the question, we must take a glance at what has been attempted in this direction. Two things have been particularly put forward : one is an artificial supply of work. This course is always ruinous and degrading, and is only justifiable in revolutionary crises. So long as men’s minds are turned this way, all sorts of extravagant things are said ; for instance, it has been said to satiety, that a court without luxury is the ruin of a nation. We see men wishing for public calamities, because they make work. It has also often been said, to make and unmake again is still work. At other times employers reply to the objections,

often very just, which are made to the execution of useless works. 'Work on, it is I who pay.'

It has even been said in writing, that it was a most fortunate circumstance that many people do nothing, in order to leave work for others, and that they consume a great deal, so as to increase the amount of work to be done. The value of such maxims is easily understood.

The second course is to preach saving. This is a virtue which is very useful, as opposed to waste, and when made subservient to the preservation of wealth. It at once loses, to a certain extent, its value, if used to promote accumulation, as opposed to the more laborious process of production. It ceases to be a virtue when it ceases to be social; it becomes a vice as soon as it begins to fetter useful development; it is a great evil as soon as it presses on the wants of life; it becomes a crime when intelligence and morality suffer from it, as when it goes to the extent of depriving the family of the care of the woman; and as if the children of the working classes were not a useful product, it has, by an unpardonable want of reflection, been thought that it ought to be carried to the length of preaching economy in the production of children. All these measures were more disastrous than useful, and have done nothing but increase the evil. To sum up what we have said, we believe that a great part of the evil comes from want of foresight; that the capitalists have but little power to prevent it; that the state can and ought to interfere, on condition that its interference be prudent and enlightened.

Consequently this is what we would propose:

That the state should always have at its disposal the necessary funds for giving employment to the workmen whom private enterprise leaves without work. The employment so given should always be, as far as possible, of public utility, and, above all, should never be the same as that which the workmen have been obliged to abandon from over-production. In general, the works should be executed by contractors, or by companies, at other times at the charge of the government. The funds should be furnished by the public treasury, and the information should come from popular local assemblies convoked by the administration, in which the

citizens should be called upon to discuss all the works to be executed, those in course of execution, and those already finished. These meetings should take place, as much as possible, in rooms supplied by the local authorities.

The meetings shall be public, and care be taken to invite the workmen who are on their travels, who are well qualified to give good information, when properly applied to. They will by this means acquire fresh knowledge, which they may turn to account in other places. These assemblies are to consider the nature of the works, their importance, their seasonableness, their management, their inconveniences, their dangers, their probable results,—in a word, everything which has any interest. They are not to order the works—they are to overlook them and give advice. Such a course would have the result of making the social point of view the order of the day, by the character of public utility which these discussions would have, and would give rise to a superintendence at once spontaneous, gratuitous, and permanent—one which should be disinterested without being indifferent, having, finally, all the characteristics of a true superintendence.

Our proposal is, no doubt, far from meeting or satisfying all the requirements of the case ; but we do not hesitate to make it, because, besides the direct utility it might have in ensuring the constant and regular employment of all the forces of society, it may render great services by helping to clear the minds of men of a crowd of false ideas which are in the way of all attempts at reorganisation.

All questions would be simplified if we saw clearly that there is plenty of work : we should then venture to meet them openly ; free trade would cease to alarm us ; inventions would be received as benefits ; the presence of foreign workmen would no longer be feared, and France would continue to be their school ; the immoral theories of Malthus would no longer be preached, because where labour is well directed bread is not wanting ; war would no longer be the antidote for industrial crises ; the unworthy dispute between the colonies and the mother country would have some chance of being brought to an end, and our navy would have freights ; we should see the emigration from the country to the towns diminish—the only way of regulating the production of articles

of luxury ; we should not be obliged to economise so much, if we were bold in production. The fortunate inclination of the young workmen to travel for instruction would be much better gratified in all professions.

Without this absurd fear pauper establishments would never have been thought of as a general measure ; nor would public nurseries nor refuges for the destitute, for these are all means of saving at the expense of happiness, and they do nothing but increase suffering.

We do not conceal from ourselves the difficulties of all kinds with which our plan will be met ; we know that its immediate material results will be far short of our wishes, but the moral results will be of great importance, and will not be slow to react upon the material.

It is as well to remark that this proposal, far from injuring any subsequent ones, will assist them.

Although the measures proposed are, as is natural, suggested by the state of things in France, they are not confined to France, though susceptible of more complete and immediate application there than elsewhere. They are equally applicable to the five Western populations, as the wants from which they proceed are common to all ; as is also the reorganisation of opinions, of feelings, and habits, in which consists the final solution which they announce and prepare.

If the governments are not sufficiently awake to the importance of these measures to apply them soon (and this might happen even in France), there is nothing to prevent the people from spontaneously setting to work on that portion of the plan which more immediately concerns them. Wherever a free popular meeting exists, it can easily make its ordinary discussions turn on those functions of direction, superintendence, and appreciation which we assign to the people with regard to the public works suitable to each locality. This new mode of utilising and developing clubs would constitute, indirectly, one of the most happy results of the plan we have drawn out.

The state, considering that the right to work is not only the right to live, but also the right to contribute to the increase of the well-being of all, shall never leave any willing to work without work. For this end, it shall have at its

disposal the funds and information necessary for giving work to those whom private enterprise ceases to employ, without competing with extraordinary industry. The works shall be of public utility.

Generally, they shall be executed by contractors or by companies, always under the immediate superintendence of the state engineers.

But, as neither the state nor its engineers can have a sufficient knowledge of the works required, but by the intervention of all citizens, the state shall convoke popular assemblies in all the communes, where the citizens shall be invited to discuss future works, in order to point out what are necessary; those in course of execution, in order to superintend them; those already finished, in order to pronounce upon them, without being able directly either to bespeak or to oppose them.

If it is true that the state cannot decree a change of opinion, it can nearly always promote it; and as, in this case, such change is the thing to be desired, the state should advise all the authorities so to word the invitations given to the citizens, so as to make them aware that the object is not to create works, but simply to point out the most seasonable ones, the difficulty being to know where to begin.

Commissioners.

MAGNIN, Working Engineer (Reporter).

JACQUEMIN, Working Engineer.

BELPAUME, Working Bootmaker.

PARIS, *Wednesday, 24 May, 1848.*

RICHARD CONGREVE.

55 PALACE GARDENS TERRACE, LONDON, W.

2 *Cæsar*, 96 (*April 25th, 1884.*)

No. 14.]

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY,

OR

HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

A SERIAL.

I.—IN MEMORIAM—JOHN GREENE MILLS.

II.—REPRINT OF A REVISED EDITION OF HIS TRANSLATION
OF *POSITIVIST PRAYERS* BY JOSEPH LONCHAMPT.

I.—IN MEMORIAM JOHN GREENE MILLS.

Mr. MILLS, the author of the translation which I subjoin, was born August 13th, 1844, at Mount Hope, near Middletown, Orange Co., New York. He received his schooling at Middletown, and graduated in law, at the Law College, Albany. These particulars I learn from Mr. R. B. Westbrook of Philadelphia, in whose office Mr. Mills spent a year after his admission to the bar, with whom he remained intimately connected, and by whom he is affectionately mourned. Mr Mills practised law in Goschen, N. Y., then in New York City, lastly in Washington, D. C. He married in 1870, died April 14th, 1883, in his thirty-ninth year, by a sadly premature death, and was buried in Laurel Grove Cemetery. For the last fifteen years of his life he was a Positivist. He leaves a widow and two children.

Such is the simple outline of a life too soon ended and full of promise.

My own connection with Mr. Mills was of the slightest. I had one letter from him. In the discussion that took place

in the Positivist body in 1877-8 he was opposed to the part I took, and so our correspondence terminated. But within three weeks of his death, he stated to a common friend, Mr. Hutcheson, that it was his intention to subscribe to both the English and French Sacerdotal fund—a proof that he had revised and modified his judgment. With such slight knowledge I must rely on others for an estimate of his actions and life.

For the first, I am told that he had awakened so much interest in Positivism by his exposition of the Religion to meetings of liberal thinkers that it was arranged to have fortnightly meetings at his house for the exclusive study of Positivism. He himself, speaking of the interest aroused, said, 'Possibly we can obtain through such a movement, by some effort, that for which I have, in fact, been aiming at in these 'liberal meetings,' and, in fact, for two years,—the establishment here of a centre of Positivism, with the nucleus of a congregation that may soon be able to inaugurate public worship.'

I give the comment of my friend upon this:—'I do not know whether he would have succeeded in forming such a congregation or not. He was personally much liked. He was open, frank, and a "good fellow" to all, and he made many warm and devoted friends. His knowledge was varied and extensive, his manner of speaking in public easy and pleasing. The interest awakened in Positivism by his remarks at these meetings was rather one of criticism and antagonism than of acceptance, but acceptance would probably have followed a further knowledge of the religion—at least in some cases.'

The estimate here given of him is amply confirmed from other sources, public and private. 'I want you to know,' says Mrs. Mills, 'how steady and strong he was. He did much for his faith, had just begun to gather around him a few to whom he was expounding it.'

Mr. Westbrook speaks of his child-like and genial disposition as contrasting beautifully with his manly strength and independence of thought and action.

All, in fact, support the language of Colonel Ingersoll at his funeral:—'He who lies here, clothed with the perfect

peace of death, was a kind and loving husband and good father, a generous neighbour, an honest man; and these words build a monument of glory above the humblest grave. He was always a child, sincere and frank, as full of hope as spring. In many languages he sought the thoughts of men, and for himself he solved the problems of the world. He accepted the philosophy of Auguste Comte. Humanity was his God, the human race the Supreme Being. He believed that we are indebted for what we enjoy to the labour, the self-denial, the heroism of the human race, and that as we have plucked the fruit of what others planted, we, in thankfulness, should plant for others yet to be. With him immortality was the eternal consequence of his own good acts. He believed that every good thought, every disinterested deed, hastens the harvest of universal good. This is a religion that enriches poverty, that enables us to bear the sorrows of the saddest life; that peoples even solitude with the happy millions yet to be; a religion not born of selfishness and fear, but of love and hope; a religion that digs wells to slake the thirst of others; that gladly bears the burdens of the unborn.'

Similar testimony was borne by his friend Mr. Fowler. I give a short extract from his speech:—'We have his example to follow, and, if we heed the precepts so many of us have heard from time to time from his lips, we shall be better, wiser, nobler, and purer, men and women. Could these pallid lips speak to us to-day they would tell us to go on in the path he has opened for us. He would counsel us to exert our efforts for Humanity, to pay our homage to Humanity, to love and serve Humanity to the end. If we can so live that, when we are as he is now, our bier will be surrounded by those who sincerely mourn our loss, who will speak in truthful accents as we have to-day in praise of the dead, we shall not have lived in vain.'

I give below a copy of a memorandum Mr. Mills left as to his funeral. It expresses with precision his attitude at the time—two years, that is, before his death.

The honour paid him, the judgments formed of him, justify us in looking with affection on his memory, with gratitude on his services rendered in life, and which will assuredly continue after his death. They justify us in

grieving for his loss as a severe one for the cause of Humanity. Everywhere the need is the same—the need of men who will with quiet firmness take their stand as disciples of the Religion of Humanity, and form centres around which others can rally. That there is much diffused belief in that Religion in the United States the language above quoted evidences. To give it body and shape individual exponents are required. Such was Mr. Mills, and as such he leaves for the present a gap. Is there not good ground for hope that others will step forward to fill the gap he leaves? Sooner or later such examples bear fruit, such men find imitators.

In any case we who in England share Mr. Mills' faith would pay a just tribute to his memory; perhaps by doing so we may in a degree soothe a deep sorrow.—R. C.

MEMORANDUM.

940 K STREET, WASHINGTON, D.C.

October 25th, 1881.

It occurring by some conversation regarding the uncertainty of life, that my wife requested me this morning, as often before, to signify my preferences, if any, I had in regard to my own burial, in the event of death.

I write this that she may not be misjudged if she survive me in carrying out what she knows to be my wishes in that event.

Leaving all details to her own good judgment, and appreciating that whatever is done in my honour on such occasion is good and useful only in its influence upon others, I record the following preferences, if it be possible to secure their fulfilment:—

1. Neither priest, parson, minister, or teacher, of theism shall conduct any ceremonies that may occur; but it is my desire that if any of my clerical friends be present, as friends, they be allowed to speak, if time permit, and good sense sanction more ceremony than my wife may arrange or provide for.

2. No church service, and no service in a church.

3. I would prefer to be buried, if interred, at Middletown, but have a preference for cremation previous to the inhumation of my ashes at Middletown.

4. My wife and my brother, if they survive me, should conduct my funeral.

5. Should either Robert G. Ingersoll or Thaddeus B. Wakeman survive me, and could either or both be procured, I would greatly desire that they, in the order named, or both, should act instead and for spokesman, preacher, or orator on such occasion.

6. If suitable and in accordance with the wishes of my wife and Col. Ingersoll, or Mr. Wakeman, on this occasion, I would recommend a piano and one or two violins, and such other chamber music should be provided as would be adequate to the production of such pieces as my wife should select.

7. Preferring and acknowledging the Religion of Humanity as instituted by Auguste Comte, and as taught by his disciples, as the best and only true religion or synthesis of life, I desire to be known after my transformation to the subjective life, *i.e.*, after death, as I have for years been known, as a Positivist, and have my funeral conducted with reference thereto.

(Signed) JOHN G. MILLS.

'This Memorandum was not found till about a month after Mr. Mills' death. As I had never read it I am very much gratified to find how near we came to its fulfilment. There was no music at the funeral.' (Note by Mrs. Mills).

POSITIVIST PRAYER.

By JOSEPH LONCHAMPT.

'For us Prayer becomes the ideal of life, for to pray is at once to love, to think, and to act.'—AUGUSTE COMTE (*Catechism*, p. 74, *E. Tr.*, 2nd Edn.).

SECOND EDITION.

PARIS: E. THUNOT & CO., No. 26, Rue Racine, August, 1853.

AUTHOR'S NOTE.—This little work was written in March, 1851, and was published at Lyons in 1852 by two devoted Positivists, to whom I hasten here to tender my sincere thanks. This second edition contains, in the form of an Appendix, a 'Letter on the Religious Mission of Woman,' judged useful for better apprehending the spirit of this essay.

Translated from the French by JOHN G. MILLS, *Member of the New York Positivist Society.*

'DIIS EXTINGTIS DEOQUE SUCCESSIT HUMANITAS.'

Prayer in the nature of Petition is rejected by the devout. Nevertheless prayer is still used. Its nobler functions of aspiration and commemoration make it essential to religious life.—J. G. M.

GOSCHEN, N. Y., Independent Republican Job Office, 1877.

II.—REPRINT OF A REVISED EDITION OF HIS
TRANSLATION OF POSITIVIST PRAYERS BY
JOSEPH LONCHAMPT.

In reprinting Mr. Mills' translation of M. Lonchampt's prayers I have more than one object in view.

1. I wish that his work may not be lost, and so I add to the slight record of his personal action his services as a translator.

2. The reproduction of his translation in an English edition connects our work in England with the American through Mr. Mills, and both with the Positivist centre in Paris through M. Lonchampt. It is useful to show where we can unity of effort throughout the Positivist body.

3. There has been a feeling, I hear, that for the form of prayer I have used in England I had no previous warrant; that I took a new departure, to use a current expression. Those who now join the Positivist movement are often not familiar with its history, consequently often misconceive it, or accept misrepresentations of it. This reprint may serve to establish the fact that many years ago, in Auguste Comte's lifetime, and with his full sanction, the direct invocation of Humanity was adopted (*see Catechism, p. 104, E. Tr., 2nd Edn.*) in 'domestic prayers, adapted to connect the public with the private worship.' The honour of this initiative is justly due to M. Lonchampt.

4. In the revision of the translation I have kept as close to Mr. Mills' work as I could. I have suppressed the key-notes as not adapted to an English public.

It is hardly necessary to add that Mrs. Mills has given her sanction and left me full discretion.—R. C.

SYSTEMATIC WORSHIP OF HUMANITY.

LOVE THE PRINCIPLE, ORDER THE BASIS, PROGRESS THE END.

INTRODUCTION.

¹For us, Prayer becomes the ideal of life. For to pray is at one and the same time to love, to think, and even to act.—AUGUSTE COMTE (*Positive Catechism*, p. 74, E. Tr., 2nd Edn.).

Science, constituted by two centuries of laborious works, and raised in our day to the dignity of positive philosophy, reveals to our intelligence a new faith, and discovers to our hearts new horizons of hope and of love.

By its irrefragable demonstrations the heaven has become to us moderns a limitless glacial space, where moves our sun with its planets, and beyond, in infinite perspective, an innumerable multitude of radiant stars; our earth, an imperceptible globe, is carried along in this imperceptible whirling of luminous or opaque spheres, all of which perform their invariable revolutions. If we turn again to our own planet our eyes, which lose themselves in the immensity of this imposing spectacle, and which are wearied by its infinite magnitude, science shows us all the phenomena there occurring as subject to invariable natural laws, so that nature becomes a vast harmony, in which all is transformed and regularly modified, and where the most unexpected phenomena are necessary consequences of other phenomena. Thus the invariability which science unveils to us in the movements of the heavenly bodies, it extends to the sum of all that goes on on the surface of our globe. There it demonstrates to us the existence of an immense series of organized bodies, reacting on the surrounding medium, and producing acts the more numerous and the more effective the more complex their organization. It is a profound sentiment of order and of regularity that we derive from this immutable economy of nature. But this unchangeableness refers only to nature considered in itself. Now, as four thousand years ago, the earth gravitates round the sun, plants and animals perform the normal functions of their unchanging

life; but the aspect of the earth is profoundly changed since that mysterious antiquity, and everywhere we see on it the trace of a powerful hand. The impenetrable forests with which its surface bristled have given place to fertile fields, swamps to rich meadows; the masses of animals which infested the continents have been destroyed or tamed; nomadic and savage races, so long busied in devouring each other, live peaceably, given up to the embellishment of their terrestrial abode and the amelioration of their common existence. What, then, is the hand which has wrought these marvels? It is the hand of Humanity; for embosomed in this immutable harmony science unveils to us the existence of a Great Being, who throughout the ages has marched gloriously to the conquest of Nature, and reigns to-day as sovereign upon Earth.

Humanity is not the human race, and does not include the whole of mankind. Humanity is the memory of the dead, inspiring and guiding the living—it is the sum of all high thoughts, of all noble sentiments, and of all great efforts, referred to one single and the same Being, of whom this unity forms the soul, the living constitute its vast body. This unceasing influence of the past upon the present is alike salutary and necessary. Let us suppose, for example, a generation of men entirely withdrawn from the influence of the preceding generations—it would be a horde of rude savages, trembling at each new phenomenon of nature, and carrying ferocity to the point of eating human flesh; in a word, this generation would re-produce the primitive state, whence Humanity started on the accomplishment of her glorious evolution. Thus it is, that to this Great Being we are indebted for all that softens, exalts, ennobles, and charms our life: to know this Being then is to love it.

Humanity, so kind to us, so beneficent for our welfare, lives in the present by men like ourselves: it is on these living servants that depend principally the velocity and sureness of her advance. The love we feel for Humanity will excite us, then, to serve her with zeal, in order to hasten, as much as lies in us, her progress towards that happy social state, on the threshold of which the present generations are invited to inhale its most subtle emanations. But science

opens this mysterious door of the future to our eager desires ; and then appears to our ravished imaginations no longer the fantastic dream of hope, but the glorious reality, the goal towards which the West is converging athwart the dark storms and the terrible agitations of the revolutionary era. This pleasant harbour, which our societies tossed by the tumultuous waves of the revolution will soon make, this future, towards which, uninterruptedly and surely, the vanguard of the race is tending, has, for its distinctive features, the establishment, in a natural way, of a new priesthood, commanding respect by its science, and confidence by its disinterestedness ; next, family life secured in all its plenitude to each proletary ; universal education given gratuitously and uniformly by the priests to all men and all women ; duties from which there is no escape, bound upon the rich in the name of the common faith, and under penalty of disgrace during their lives, and of oblivion after their death ; finally, the worship of Humanity, which will shed upon the most ordinary details of human life the poetic rays of hope and of love.

One of the surest means of consecrating all our efforts to the service of the new Great Being is the daily use of prayer. To pray to Humanity will not be to ask of her power an immediate change in the existing order, nor to implore of her goodness direct help in misfortune ; such a prayer would be contrary to the knowledge which science gives us of the supreme existence, an existence, as our own, subjected to invariable laws. Humanity modifies the power of nature, it is true, but slowly and with regularity. Humanity comes to the aid of suffering mankind, but only by ameliorating more and more the conditions of our existence.

To pray is to pour out our gratitude and our love towards Humanity ; it is likewise to ask for a noble progress for our soul. This prayer is always heard, for the sincere avowal of our imperfections and of our faults and the ardent wish to better and purify our hearts are the guarantees of an infallible success.

Daily prayer will render us, then, better, and in perfecting us, it becomes useful to Humanity, for this new Great Being has need of our co-operation, and as prayer consolidates and

purifies this co-operation, it profits by our prayers. God, the creator of the universe, could do without the prayers and thanksgivings of his creatures, his omnipotence and majesty sufficing him. The prayer of the Christian, as that of the Musalman, was useful only to himself, while our prayer is useful not only to ourselves but also to Humanity.

The worship of Humanity is composed of private and public worship, both already instituted among her worshippers. The first, quite private and personal, addresses prayers to woman, considered as mother, sister, wife, or daughter ; to the beloved beings taken from our love, and whose memory guides and consoles our lives ; to the Supreme Being to implore her grace in the incessant daily work of perfecting ourselves. This worship is not susceptible of any general formula, since it varies with each person and even with each age ; it springs spontaneously from the heart, and can only be expressed by improvised effusions. But concurrently with this private worship is developed that common to the whole family, a true intermediary between private and public worship. It seemed to me possible to formulate prayers for its use, and I have endeavoured to write a series of them for all the days of the week in accordance with the consecration of those days given on the tenth page of the Positivist Calendar, 4th edition (see *Pos. Catech., E. Tr., 2nd Edn., p. 104*).

PRAYER FOR MONDAY.

HOLY HUMANITY, our mother and our benefactress, blessed be thou on this first day in the week, for the first fundamental tie, source of all the others, for marriage, which thy love ministered to by thy genius is at length about to institute among us in all its perfection. I would retrace in memory the steps of continuous perfecting by which thou hast raised this great institution to its definitive condition, for this examination will kindle my heart with love for thy maternal solicitude, and revive in me my faith in thy power and glory.

Even in thy first infancy thou didst manifest woman as the source of all love, and in the forced seclusion of the polytheistic age, thou didst plant the germ of the worship of

woman—a worship holy and tender, by which we raise ourselves to thy worship. But it was in thy youth, so simple and so poetic, that by the instrumentality of our immortal predecessors of the middle ages, thou didst truly sketch out the union of man and woman as one and indissoluble; a sublime inchoate conception which thou but now hast completed for us, by perpetuating beyond the tomb the indissolubility which death mocked at, and by assigning to this fundamental tie an aim which it can always attain. For now thou proclaimest the supreme perfection of marriage as entirely independent of paternity, and as characterised solely by the beneficent and eternal action of the heart of woman upon the feelings of man; thus thou wilt wipe away the secret tears of the childless wife, and thou wilt take from her the unjust opprobrium which was cast upon her innocence. How admirable is this conception which thou wilt still further perfect by inaugurating shortly, in the regenerated West, the abolition of the odious intervention of wealth in marriage, an interference formidable to our happiness! Then goodwill, gentleness, kindness, and love will constitute the only dower of woman; the devotion with which she has discharged the holy functions of daughter and of sister will be all that she brings: thus will she appear rich in her poverty to the young man who, on his knees, shall entreat her to become the good angel of his heart, the inseparable companion of his life and of his memory, his holy colleague in his final incorporation into the Supreme Existence.

Woman giving to man the affectionate care and pleasures of the domestic fireside, receiving from him in exchange all the means of existence which labour procures: woman inspiring man with the suavity and tenderness of her heart, and receiving from him in exchange energy of character, and the light of intelligence: these are the true functions of man and woman in the eternal life. Yes, it is the couple united by the sacrament of marriage which is really the elementary organ of the sublime existence of Humanity; alone, man, as woman, has but an incomplete life, imperfect function of the universal life; but man, beloved by the woman whom he loves, softened and bettered by the tender and devoted affection of the companion of his choice; man consecrating all the solicitude of

his heart to secure the happiness of the guardian angel of his domestic hearth,—this is an image of thee, imperfect, but real, it is a faithful likeness of thee, SUPREME BEING, thou whose genius is the devoted minister of thy heart, whose vast and sublime intelligence has had no other aim, during its long and painful elaboration, than the satisfaction of the immeasurable love, of the insatiable tenderness of thy great soul.

How intimate is this fundamental tie of marriage! How holy is it, this union of two hearts which even death cannot dis sever, and whose two memories become entirely one in a single and identical regret!

A day will come when the quest of a worthy marriage will be the ruling thought of our hearts; auspicious time, when we shall all draw from this wellspring of love the most precious help in perfecting our natures, in improving our hearts, and in beautifying our souls. But at the present day, athwart the stormy regeneration of the West, in seeking a worthy union we tremble lest we bound our sympathies within a happy dual egoism, and wall up our hearts against the sufferings of our brethren; and if we give ourselves over to tasting in peace the salutary enjoyments of conjugal love, let us not cease to remember that the vast majority of proletaries see this happiness for ever interdicted to their noble hearts, or only taste it very imperfectly, troubled as it is by the cruel ordeals of poverty, and, above all, by the hard work which takes the wife from the domestic hearth. By the aid of these thoughts, the heart of woman, far from numbing our energy by enervating pleasure, will kindle it into a wholesome zeal to call to this true happiness of man all those of our brethren whom our revolutionary crisis has so deplorably disinherited.

HOLY HUMANITY, we have faith in thy power and in th love; in a near future thou wilt ensure to each of us th sweet peace of family life, offering to proletaries and womer as a compensation for their poverty, a more entire enjoymer of domestic felicity; for such is the regeneration which tho achievest through us, despite the greatest obstacles, namely the great institution of marriage rendered accessible to all, an ennobled by all the glory of a common and universal education

May we then, with all our powers, co-operate with efficiency in this vast work, and hasten the regeneration of opinions, manners, and habits, the necessary precursor of the regeneration of social institutions, by teaching men to know thee, to love thee, and to serve thee, SUPREME BEING, HOLY HUMANITY, who wilt reward worthily the efforts of thy first worshippers by a final and glorious incorporation in thy eternal existence.

PRAYER FOR TUESDAY.

HOLY HUMANITY, our mother and our benefactress, blessed be thou to-day for the second fundamental tie, the happy ordinary consequence of marriage; blessed be thou for the paternal relation which thy sublime soul has rendered so noble and so touching. It is, above all, maternal love that offers us a faithful image of thy tenderness: as thou, the mother loves her child whatever it be, she seems even to reserve for the deformed or ugly child all the treasures of her love; and thou, likewise, holy HUMANITY, our kind mother, thou receivest us all within thy breast, whatever our unworthiness and thou dost measure thy care and thy tenderness by our weakness and our needs.

But it is the love of our fathers which should increase our gratitude to thee, for it is this that is the sweet and precious fruit of the persevering efforts of thy great soul. The mother has always loved her child, for woman is thy heart, HOLY HUMANITY, and from thy earliest infancy that heart thrilled with love; but for man, the organ of thy intelligence and of thy power, it required long struggles for thee to conquer the natural weakness of his sympathy and to enkindle his love even to his own children. I would remind myself that during thy whole childhood the misshapen child was pitilessly put to death as unworthy; that in the beautiful days of thy youth the father sacrificed his sons and daughters to his schemes of pride, by brutally interring them in the perpetual solitude of the cloister. I would recall these remembrances to increase my gratitude to thee, SUPREME BEING, who givest to each of us a tender and devoted mother and a kind father, living with her in tenderness; who, not satisfied with placing

our cradle under their sweet guard, in thy solicitude bringest to it another couple, formed by the choice of those who gave us life, and bestowest on us good and affectionate sponsors to replace our father and mother in case we should have the terrible misfortune to lose them.

Blessed be thou, HOLY HUMANITY, for the tender ardour with which thou art completing in the regenerated West this sweet tie which attaches the father and mother to the fruit of their love: for it is one of the objects of the constant efforts of thy soul to ensure to paternity the entire expansion so essential to our happiness. Alas! how this tender tie is even yet weakened by the hard conditions which oppress the proletariat at the present day, and how often is it a source of bitter tears to their noble hearts. For, indeed, it is painful for a mother to entrust to another woman the little child which has learned to smile upon her, and yet she is driven to it, poor soul, in order to earn during the whole day the daily bread. Horrible, too, is it for a father to condemn to crushing work the feeble child who, without strength, without air, without sunshine, blanches and dies—a tender rosebud withered before blooming. Hide from our sight, tears of sympathy, hide these gloomy realities that we may catch a glimpse of the smiling aurora which is rising on the West; for it comes to kindle all hearts, this new faith, which will change the face of the earth and cause order and happiness to reign in the societies of man. Already we are close upon the happy times and the new era, when every man, whatever be his function in the common existence, will be enabled to slake the thirst of his heart in the holy enjoyments of conjugal love, and ground his immortality on the regret rooted in the hearts of his children by marriage or by adoption.

Sweet joys of paternity, holy tenderness, ye will one day purify the hearts of all men! In time ye shall be the guide of their conduct, for the duty of providing HUMANITY with a worthy servant appears to the father as a saving beacon in the tempest of life, and the thought that the first education of the child is the instinctive imitation of his conduct becomes the potent helm which makes him avoid all unworthiness, turns him from all that degrades the soul and directs him towards perfection. Thus man steers with courage amidst

reefs and sandbanks, his eyes fixed on his successors, and the sweet vision of his immortality lights up his old age as a long twilight.

Ah! may it come then, this social regeneration by which thou art to crown thy slow and painful evolution; may it come, **HOLY HUMANITY**, to heal these wounds, to relieve these sufferings, to blot out this distress which cries for vengeance instead of imploring thy aid; and may it come to conjure this storm which mutters low over the West, and threatens, by scattering for a time materials and workers, to delay the construction of the new social edifice. May we all hasten its accomplishment and undertake with energy that which thou expectest from each of thy servants. To work, then, all we who suffer, all we who know that the hour of deliverance may strike for us; for all is ready, and suffering **HUMANITY** pines away through our culpable indolence. We may not doubt of success, since we are aiding the Great Being in its irresistible advance. To work, then, and let us see even now our obscure names shining in letters of gold on the pedestal of the Future.

PRAYER FOR WEDNESDAY.

HOLY HUMANITY, our mother and our benefactress, blessed be thou again for the fundamental tie of the filial relation, which is for us the school of love. Through it we open our hearts to tenderness, for when we come into the world the only feeling we have is a profound egoism, the true original sin from which thy grace has to redeem us. Filial love is the first step by which we raise ourselves to thy love, **SUPREME BEING**; filial love is the first aliment of those sublime sympathetic faculties, the source of our happiness. Thus it is that we love thee in the love we feel for those who have brought us to the light of life; and it is under the loved features of a mother that we are first enabled to idealize thee and represent thee to our imagination.

Ah! what necessity was there that this sweet bond, so holily formed by our catholic predecessors, should be too grievously weakened by revolutionary agitation, which by its too long continuance is exhausting the West? How many

noble proletaries, without shelter, without home, without means of support, see themselves compelled to carry to the hospital or poor-house the aged mother who nourished them, and depart after depositing this precious burden with rapid step and agony of heart, without the hope of cheering by their presence the last moments of the poor invalid, without the consolation of being able to place a wreath each year upon the tomb of their mother! But poverty, the frightful leprosy of our age of iron, is not the only thing that weakens the filial tie, for hideous egoism taints with its empoisoned breath even this first flower of our souls; it is selfishness which offers to us the distressing sight of the aged, dying forsaken among mere paid attendants, after bringing up and endowing numerous children, who, absorbed in their personal affections, look with dry eyes on all suffering outside their own family hearth, and pitilessly allow their aged father to die in solitude. But, also, how many sons, how many daughters, cloistered since their earliest years in the school of a pedantic pride, grow up far from the family, their only tie to which soon comes to consist in the degrading apprehensions of pecuniary dependence, or the deceptive hope of a tardy inheritance! Ah! if the cold sociability of the transition state is sadly fertile in dry and hard hearts, it is because without the apprenticeship of filial love man cannot experience the noble sentiments of universal sympathy; it is because, unless he has been a good son, man cannot become a worthy servant of HUMANITY.

Filial tenderness, be always living in our hearts, come and revive without ceasing our noblest feelings, thou, the source of all love, thou, the first conqueror of hideous egoism; come and guide us in the path of goodness and duty, and sustain us in the temptations of each day; thou who, by prolonging beyond the tomb the blessed memory of a father and a mother, dost show us how we can enlarge the boundaries of our life and triumph over death.

PRAYER FOR THURSDAY.

HOLY HUMANITY, our mother and our benefactress, blessed be thou on this day for the sweet fraternal tie; through

fraternity our heart opens to the love of our kind, by it, it rises to pure and unselfish tenderness; it is its sweet name of fraternity that expresses this noble aspiration of thy soul: 'All men are brothers.'

Filial love, which awakens in us the sympathetic faculties, has on it the blot of an interested impulse; the holy affection of our mothers is so keen, so devoted, that our sympathy, if confined to this first degree, would insensibly degenerate into egoistic affection. But fraternal love, which extends attachment in childhood to our brothers and sisters; which, later, tears us from the sweets of the domestic hearth to lead us to their homes, there to share their sorrows and their pains; which opens our heart to sweet friendship, a holy extension of brotherly love beyond the limited circle of the family; here we have the first germ of that universal love of man, the aim of our social existence, the true source of the love of thee, HOLY HUMANITY; for to love thee we must love all thy servants, whose individual lives constitute thy life in the present; above all, we must love thy straying or suffering servants, whom we should lead back into the right way and restore to health by prodigies of love; for upon the service they give depends thy prosperity, HOLY HUMANITY, and thy prosperity is our happiness.

Fraternal love, sweet friendship, the growth of which will one day be so powerfully aided by an education common to all men, ye are to-day the only social bond which we can still fully enjoy in the arid desert where our thirsty hearts pine; for in our evil days the great majority among us see the promised land for ever forbidden us, the living source of love, at which we ought to be able to quench our thirst and draw inexhaustible tenderness for our hearts. Come, noble fraternity, keep up in our souls the fire of sympathy; come, save us from the egoistic melancholy to which we are but too prone; offer thy sweet enjoyments to the heart of the proletary whom our defective social state deprives of the holy joys of marriage and of paternity, nay, even of the sweet duties of filial piety; lead women from the domestic sanctuary to a sister, to a friend; give to her heart this spring, and, lo! she consecrates all her leisure to weeping with the afflicted, to nursing the sick, to comforting the unfortunate. Sweet friendship, come

to enlarge for us all the bounds of sympathy; for we never tire of loving. Thus raised by thy sweet influence, we shall be more fit to aid in the social regeneration, in this great work of HUMANITY, on which depends the happiness and the glory of our race.

PRAYER FOR FRIDAY.

It is in this last fundamental tie that there shines above all the benevolence of thy heart, SUPREME BEING, whose life is but an exhaustless centre of love and of light; it is in the relation of domestic service that is made manifest the intelligent perseverance of thy soul. How victoriously has it been transformed by thee, this tie rendered during thy long childhood so imperfect by slavery, and again impaired by serfage in the days of thy charming youth; how nobly and sacredly is it now established among us, where free sympathy alone determines henceforth this alliance, which was formerly involuntary and indissoluble; but thy preserving goodness will not stop here; thou wilt give to this institution its supreme perfection by proclaiming that the salary is always an inadequate return, never dispensing with gratitude, never even lessening our gratitude at all. Thou wilt also extend to all industrial relations the noble ameliorations which thou hast introduced in the tie of domesticity, and thus employers and workmen will consider themselves as really associated to co-operate actively in thy potent and sovereign action upon nature.

With what touching solicitude hast thou already balanced the duties of master and servant, HOLY HUMANITY, so as to make the happiness of either depend on the scrupulous observance of their reciprocal duties. Gentleness, indulgence, consideration on one side, and in return fidelity, respect, attachment and devotion. And this relation which begins in a pecuniary transaction can reach the sublimest heights of affection and sacrifice.

We bless thee, HOLY HUMANITY, for the institution of this last fundamental bond, which offers to domestic happiness a happy complement, as it relieves the mother of the family in

her numerous household cares by the assistance of a young helper, who in return learns in this household precious lessons for her own future. It is this tie again which offers the old man a salutary refuge from isolation and abandonment, by bringing to his sad retreat an honest heart which in his last days ministers to him, sweetening the close of life by its devotion. Finally, it is at present the only resource of too many holy women, doomed to childless celibacy by our social anarchy, which seems to regard as a crime their poverty and even their virtue.

Blessed be thou, SUPREME BEING, for this chain of fundamental ties, which, taking our heart in its original egoism, raises it by insensible degrees up to thy love, the inexhaustible source of felicity and glory. Filial love, brotherly friendship, conjugal tenderness, holy paternity, and thou, too, watchful care of servants, ye are for our hearts not merely healthful enjoyments, but also necessary preparations for the true destiny of those hearts; for it is only by thy love, SUPREME BEING, that we can complete our happiness, only by it can we merit finally a glorious incorporation in thy sublime and eternal existence.

PRAYER FOR SATURDAY.

Eve of the Sunday, eve of the day consecrated to the SUPREME BEING, we would sanctify thee by the worship of love, by the worship of woman, the symbol of HUMANITY, image and likeness of her soul. It is in glorifying woman that we can alone prepare ourselves to glorify thee worthily, SUPREME BEING, for thy worship speaks still more to the heart than to the intellect, and how could we better adjust our souls to the fulness of affection than through prayer addressed to their guardian angels?

Let us bless this day WOMAN, no longer merely as daughter, as wife, and as mother, but as the loving mediator between man and HUMANITY. For it is by this title, common to all women, that they should be glorified in our common prayers. Every true man in heart pays secret adorations to one woman blessed among all; but we all should unite to bless woman,

considered in that which characterises her nature, considered as the manifestation of the love of the GREAT BEING, as the organ of HUMANITY'S tenderness, as the intermediary between her sublime soul and our feeble souls, as the mediating angel between HUMANITY and her servants.

It is through the heart of woman that HUMANITY pours upon us the treasures of love; it is under the sympathetic features of woman that she appears at the sick bed to relieve its suffering; it is by woman's sweet tears that she consoles the afflicted by sharing his sorrows; it is by woman's prudent hand that she dispenses the aid of her charity, securing the acceptance without humiliation of that which she causes to be offered with graceful kindness; it is in woman's breast, it is in her heart so prompt to understand all misfortune that she offers a refuge to the unfortunate; here is the haven which welcomes us after the storm, where we draw new strength to enable us to confront anew the dangers of the perilous passage of this life towards immortality.

WOMAN, living source of hope, inexhaustible flame of love, in thee reside all goodness, all pity, all succour; thou who always givest more than is asked of thee, and whose generosity knows how to lend to thy weakness all the resources of power. In thee are magnificence, majesty, glory; in thee, the burning rays of whose heart cause to blossom in the young man the noble sentiments, great thoughts, and beautiful language which place him later in the van of HUMANITY as one of the most precious jewels of her shining crown.

Ah! we bless you, noble and holy women, we bless you, we praise you, we glorify you in our humble prayer, sighing for the day when surging crowds of men in the temples of HUMANITY shall fill the air with songs of glory and thanksgiving, their eyes full of the sweet tears of gratitude and of love, on their knees before a beautiful statue of woman, the tender and sublime representative of HUMANITY.

But whilst waiting for these happy times, our veneration for you must not be barren; if it is through the gentle influence of your hearts that the SUPREME BEING works out the prodigies of its love and the wonders of its social life, it is by us, by our energetic concurrence, by our intelligent

co-operation, that it accomplishes its slow but imperishable progress, its successive and regular transformations. Our gratitude for your goodness should translate itself into respect and daily adorations, but above all into unceasing efforts to hasten the regeneration of the West; then HUMANITY will offer to your sympathy a vast career of happiness and glory. Devoting you to poverty by forbidding dowries and inheritance, she will liberate your hearts from the fatal seductions of wealth, which in our days corrupt so profoundly so many women of great endowments; making your position secure by imposing on the man the imperative duty of supporting the woman, if he fails, imposing it on the family and the church, she will deliver your lives from the obstacles which too often rise between that life and its true object, between that life and the only theatre of your glory; then your existence will be devoted wholly to the loving duties of the domestic Providence and to the sublime functions of the mediating angel between man and HUMANITY.

PRAYER FOR SUNDAY.

HOLY HUMANITY, blessed be thou on this solemn day of Sunday, for the supreme tie, the bond of religion, which forms into a single and same GREAT BEING all the generations of mankind, and unites us by the closest sympathy not only to those who will come to continue our work, but also especially to those who have preceded us on the earth, and who, by their labours and achievements, have endowed us with all that softens and ennobles and gives charm to our existence.

For we now know the law of thy progressive development, HOLY HUMANITY, and imposing silence on the objections of a foolish pride we can go back to the rudest fetichism to discover the true fountain-head of our glorious advance, and the real germs of all the social ties. It was by lending to natural phenomena a life similar to our own that thou didst overcome the native torpor of our feeble intelligence; by the adoration of a common Fetich thou didst unite divers vagrant bands into the tribe, and by fixing the tribe on a river, which was an object of worship, thou didst lay the first stone of the

sublime edifice of human society, the marvellous temple of thy eternal glory.

It is with profound veneration and tender gratitude that we honour the memory of those inspired men who, depriving matter of the life which feeling had instinctively assumed it to possess, transferred it to inaccessible and independent beings, so made the cause of all motion and the source of all activity. For by them, HOLY HUMANITY, thou hast done great things: by those venerable priests of dreaded gods thou didst form in their embryonic state the normal functions of thy life, and the fundamental relations which bind us one to another, and all to THEE: by the conception of gods thou didst open a vast career to the imagination of man, the ancient master-works of which will ever charm mankind. Thou didst also offer to nascent observation a path at first very humble, but which was destined in the series of ages to lead it to THEE, HOLY HUMANITY, who, under the name of COUNTRY, receivedst, even in that very remote age, very glorious homage, and inspiredst very pure devotedness in that great people which marched perseveringly to the conquest of the world, and which by war civilized the whole vanguard of mankind.

But it is, above all, the beautiful spring-time of thy life which excites our sympathetic admiration, the time when, with all the artless confidence of youth thou madest such noble efforts to establish the unity of the West, and to fix the eternal foundations of social order on the groundwork of a sublime monotheism, an unsteady base, alas! For, causing to be revealed to men one only God, creator of the universe, supreme judge of all creatures, thou didst transfer from earth to heaven the aim of human life. By constructing the last judgment at the foot of God's throne, thou didst subordinate politics to morals, didst separate the spiritual from the temporal power, and didst give to all the social ties an admirable tenderness and a holy purity. Mighty HUMANITY, when we behold these wonders worked by thy genius, despite the fragile nature of the chimerical conceptions of thy youth, what confidence should we not feel in the prodigies of thy maturity!

Painful though the sight of destruction be, before our

eyes plunge into the splendours of thy future we must consider thee as thou didst lose, one by one, thy sweet illusions, and as thou didst demolish, stone by stone, the glorious construction which thou hadst but just completed with so much labour ; but also we must see thee preparing, in the midst of the ruins, the materials of the social edifice which will deliver us from the inclemency of the revolutionary era and will save us from its formidable tempests. Terrible crisis to pass through, where the evil extends, **HOLY HUMANITY**, even to the purest organs of thy life ; days of peril and suffering for us, to whom the most arid egoism would still appear the sole refuge of human felicity, had we not the happiness to know thee, and had we not the holy initiative in the Western regeneration.

By teaching us to live in heart and mind with all our illustrious predecessors, thou detachest us from earth and its wretchedness to raise us up to thee, **SUPREME BEING**, glorious **HUMANITY**, into whom love fully incorporates us. We share thy sufferings, we follow the course of thy achievements, we grasp the aim of thy efforts, the aspiration of thy soul, and, through this intimate communion, we taste already the blessedness of thy ages of glory. For, from these sublime heights, beyond the dark clouds which strike with blindness the destroyers of the past, and freeze with terror those whom its ruins shelter, we discover, resplendent with light, the immensity of the future.

Blessed, then, be thou, **HOLY HUMANITY**, sole arbiter of the destinies of human society, blessed be thou, for the complete incorporation of our soul into **THINE**, by which we are real sharers of thy sublime existence. Thus, thou openest for our hearts all the treasures of thy love, thou lendest to our understanding all the resources of thy genius, covering us with thy grace, thou makest us judges of the past, counsellors of the present, and prophets of the future. Ah ! blessed be thou for this higher tie which unites in time and space all men in **THEE**, **SUPREME BEING**, whose hand guides us on earth, and within whose bosom our soul expands in an eternal and glorious Unity, formed to direct the living generations on the path of progress and to hover over their heads as their true and perpetual **PROVIDENCE**.

LETTER ON THE RELIGIOUS MISSION OF WOMAN.

BY JOSEPH LONCHAMPT.

Translated for my Wife, July, 1874, BY JOHN G. MILLS.

MADAM,— You are constantly reproaching me for criticisms, so easy to make, which, I confess, too often escape me in regard to the doctrines which seem the official guides of our social order. I accept humbly your reproaches, and will venture to ask you to receive in excuse the exposition of certain ideas which I consider better adapted to direct our conduct and to lead us toward perfection.

Permit me, madam, at once to enter on, as of greater interest for you, the question of the religious mission of woman.

All souls as happily endowed as yours instinctively understand the duties of daughter, wife, and mother; I will not then pause to enumerate or define them, I prefer dwelling on the conditions which alone can give full efficacy to this wholesome influence of woman upon her father, her husband, or her son.

In our days the difference of religious opinion rises like a rampart of ice between man and woman: this it is which all at once shakes filial veneration and changes respect into commiseration; this it is which detaches the wife from the husband, and makes her seek another confidant, another adviser, and, soon, another friend: this it is, also, which deprives of their force the wise counsels of a mother.

In so great an evil there are but two paths of salvation: either women will bring men back to the beliefs which they have discarded; or men, escaping from doubt, and submitting to a faith, will lead women to share that faith with them.

Often, madam, you have avowed to me your fears as to the first method; and, when I have set before you the religion which regulates my conduct and already unites me to a small number of sympathetic spirits, you have based upon the second mode a more serious hope.

This faint hope will, I trust, change into conviction, when

you shall know the sublime functions reserved for woman. Not only would we bless her as mother, sister, wife, and daughter, giving to these cherished titles a value hitherto unattainable, but we also aspire to be able finally to proclaim her as the mediating angel between the Supreme Being and ourselves, and to adore her as the sweetest and purest representation of that Being.

Men have in all ages had intermediaries between their weakness and the Superior Beings whom they have successively invoked. The pontiffs of antiquity were the means of communication—the mystic bridge which put the people into relation with their gods ; Christ interceded with his father for the weak and the suffering ; but later there arose between Jesus and his brethren a gentle mediatrix who soon absorbed the prayers of gentle souls. Mary became the advocate whom the suppliant preferred, the privileged refuge of the unfortunate.

We come, madam, to sanction this tender aspiration of our predecessors, and to restore to woman the benedictions which, too often, even yet, are unjustly offered to an empty and glacial heaven. We shall again place upon our altars, as the symbol of tenderness and of purity, a young mother holding her son in her arms, and it is to this mediating virgin that our prayers will be henceforth addressed and our homage rendered.

The peoples who are living in disquiet on the earth do not constitute the only real force in conflict with our eternal destiny. How weak would be this army of the living if left to itself ? See it, deprived of all aid, on those distant shores, dragging out its miserable life. For why ? Over those belated populations is not as yet extended the protecting arm of the Dead. For what constitutes our strength, for us Westerns, is that great family of ancestors whose tender solicitude amassed for us inexhaustible treasures of happy inspirations, of precious examples, and sublime conceptions. The Being who lives on our planet is, then, in reality, composed of living and dead ; of a visible and of an invisible part ; of a body and a soul. The man who communes most intimately with this higher world shares, even in the present life, in this two-fold human existence, and forms a part at

once of the body and soul of Humanity; he becomes the organ of her thoughts and of her sentiments. Herein is a living source of dignity and of happiness. For it is holy, this church of the dead, into which none enter who are not resplendent with beauty and glory, after having been purified of imperfections and weakness; and the meditative soul which lives in this sanctuary has a foretaste of the felicity of that wished-for time when the living and the dead shall fuse in a sublime unity, through the complete harmony of thoughts and feelings.

This immortal soul of the dead, which hovers over us as our perpetual providence, is revealed to the nations through men of genius, whom it inspires. But there is for every heart another revelation, which never is wanting to him who sincerely implores it; this revelation, full of charms, issues from woman. She it is who at the domestic hearth represents the salutary influence of love, a hidden force which noiselessly purifies and transforms the felicity of man.

In the family, the woman has alone the leisure to cultivate the inner life, the mysterious portal of the invisible world. Labour absorbs every moment of the man; the difficulties to be conquered exhaust the resources of his energies; he lives for the day, soon forgetful of the close bond of common interest which unites him to his kind, and ignoring the human continuity which subordinates him to his ancestors. It is then that egoism stifles in him every other feeling, and, as a conqueror, seizes on his soul; he is lost if he have not to save his heart a beloved wife, whose clear-sighted tenderness knows how to overcome his cold resistance, and to draw him, despite himself, towards the holy splendours of the religious life.

But for this victory the instinct of the heart is too weak a weapon. A transport of tenderness may arrest the man upon the verge of the precipice, a sacrifice may rescue him from the threatening waves; but to save him from the stagnant slough of selfishness mere devotedness soon depletes its impotence. Then woman calls to her aid the venerable voice of the old faith; but its weak and uncomprehended tones only awaken a smile of contempt in this already frozen heart. To revive it, then, is needed the invincible power of

the Supreme soul: daughter, sister, wife, or mother, let woman become in the family the oracle of Humanity, the stern voice of the past, the triumphal song of the future; let her make us love and bless the superior Being, before whom science prostrates us in humility; and we shall see the lewd tempter of youth, the sceptical demon of pride and hideous egoism, recoil vanquished before this new cherubim,* the indefatigable guardian of the domestic paradise.

Then, when, in the steps of this gentle protector, man's imagination shall seek to body forth this great soul whose rays vivify his feeble heart, then will appear to him in radiance, as its most perfect shape, the angel who extends to him her hand; and falling on his knees he will cry out in gratitude: 'It is thee I would adore, for this dear adoration is also the worship of the immortal soul, all whose perfections thou offerest me and whose most precious blessing thou art.'

But to represent Humanity to the eyes of all, to become her most faithful image, woman must be covered by the sacred mantle of religion. In vain will she appropriate to herself all the thoughts and sentiments of the Supreme soul; in vain watching herself incessantly she will raise herself upon the wings of purity towards the highest perfection; in vain her heart delivered from the shameful yoke of selfishness will be resplendent with all the virtues and pour out in great waves upon all around her consolation, love, and hope: if she has not solemnly contracted before the priest of Humanity the obligation of eternal widowhood, she may still be the guardian of one heart, the moral providence of a family, but she will not have that superhuman prestige which prostrates us all at her feet.

To extend to the memory of the beloved one the faithful solicitude with which the wife watched over him throughout his life; to proclaim by this noble worship the esteem and the affection of which he was worthy; to transmit to the poor orphans the maxims and designs of a father; this is the task imposed upon the daughters of Humanity by the terrible blow which deprives them of a husband. But is it not thus that

* Cherubim is, of course, a plural word, but the common usage of the term enables it to convey the author's meaning (the using this word) better than if used in the singular.—J. G. M.

the eternal soul triumphs over death? Should a premature death quench the torch of genius, or too great difficulties paralyse its ardour, Posterity, that just and equitable voice, weeps for its misfortune or consecrates its noble efforts; should a man be misjudged or calumniated, glory rescues his name from oblivion or brands his detractors. The wife united to her husband, forever consecrating her life to inspire and guide his soul, to defend and glorify his memory, to continue his work; here we have the sweetest and truest representation of Humanity, considered as judge of the past, as rewarder of virtue, and as the inspirer of the future. Women, this is the mission which you instinctively accomplish, but which we entreat you to accept knowingly: become the daughters of Humanity, and you will overthrow the barriers, too often insurmountable, which separate us from you; speak to us in the name of this new Supreme Being, and you will behold us docile to your holy remonstrances; speak to us of her blessings and of her love, and you will see us courageous and strong, struggling for the good. Women, unite yourselves to us in one faith and in one hope, and then will be fully realised the word of the Master: 'Soon the knee of man will bend only to woman.'*

Pardon me, madam, the length of this letter; but on thinking over the virtues and the talents which heighten the lustre of your beauty, I could not resist the desire to show you what, with a ray of her grace, Humanity could make of such a woman as you.

* Auguste Comte, *Politique Positive* (E. Tr., vol. I., p. 208.) Tome I., p. 209, &c.

No. 15.]

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY,

OR

HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

A SERIAL.

BURMAH.

It is but too probable, looking at the general policy of our Indian Government, and the aims and character of the two public men with whom at present its direction rests, Lords Salisbury and Lytton ; looking also at all the professions of the supreme Government as a whole ; that had it not been for this unjustifiable Afghan war, we should have been by this time engaged in an attack on Burmah. Such an attack would have had for its real, if not avowed, object, the annexation of that kingdom to our Indian Empire.

It is against any such action that I wish to speak. If adjourned now, it is likely to be resumed when circumstances favour. Whatever the demerits of the King of Burmah, they are beside the question. A war upon him could be but a war of aggression, not of self-defence, even if we limit the term to our Indian possessions. It would be, in fact, the consummation of Lord Dalhousie's iniquitous spoliation of Burmah, which has never, I believe, been sanctioned by any diplomatic consent of the Burmese Government. The result of our wrong-doing has been a permanent and legitimate ill-feeling towards us on the part of that Government, an ill-feeling which must render any of the ordinary diplomatic intercourse undesirable, and the presence of a British Resident an irrita-

tion. The Indian Government has wisely withdrawn its representative, and would do well to abandon all wish for his return under existing circumstances, till in fact its own character and attitude have completely changed, and the danger of degradation which is attendant on the presence of such Residents shall have passed away. A standing risk of collision would thus be removed.

But more should be done. I hesitate not to say,—and I speak not for myself alone;—in the name of a purer human morality, now brought to bear on the relations of all states equally, that our Government should undo Lord Dalhousie's act, retrace its steps, and restore to Burmah all of which it was stripped by an act of naked robbery in 1852. England has much to do in the way of reparation, but there are few cases in which reparation is so called for as it is towards Burmah; few, I may add, in which it is at once so natural and so easy. There can be no compulsion in this case. Let England, then, do what is her obvious duty, restore an unrighteous gain. It were a nobler task than seeking to extend her unwieldy and oppressive dominion.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

17 MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, W.C.

7 *Descartes*, 91 (14 October, 1879).

In the six years which have passed since the above paper was issued, the Afghan war and the complications arising therefrom have, at least for a time, been settled, and the Government of India now has its hands free. We have again in power the same statesman who directed its policy in 1879, and as his subordinate at the India Office, Lord Randolph Churchill. It need not surprise us then to find that the aggression on Burmah is resumed, and that an Anglo-Indian force is on its way to annex Burmah, or to effect an arrangement very much in the nature of annexation (so the Indian Secretary phrases it at Birmingham) unless the King of Burmah yields in time—and by yielding, what is meant but the renunciation of all independence?

It is difficult to qualify justly the language of this random

young statesman, with whom blood-guiltiness is on a level with trouble and expense, and whose ultimate appeal is nakedly enough to the hunger of the commercial classes for a new market, irrespective of all higher considerations. In this hunger lies the real danger, for neither political party is strong enough or bold enough to face the pressure it implies. The times are hard, the depression great and widespread—all this gives strength to the vague hopes which are held out. 'A firm and resolute policy towards Burmah,' we are told, 'if it is guided wisely, persevered in and not interrupted (the meaning is clear enough) may offer such an extraordinary development to British manufacturers, that it is possible there are many in this hall who might live to see the day when British commerce will be again enjoying those leaps and bounds which Mr. Gladstone some years ago was so eloquent about.' It is a bold bid, unencumbered with scruples. Calmly examined, is it a wise one—a wise one commercially in the first place? Is there any probability that such advantages will be reaped? Similar hopes have been encouraged in the past and one after the other they have been disappointed. There seems no solid reason why this particular one should be an exception. More is required than the seizure of Upper Burmah to right the essentially unsound fabric of our English commercial existence.

But whether justified or not by the commercial result, the policy indicated will be carried out. The whole thing has been managed in the usual way. Internal misgovernment, French interference, insult alleged in order to awaken national pride, exaggerated statements of wrongs done to British traders—wrongs which so far as they are real may be a most legitimate subject of discussion with the Burmese Government—all kinds of specious pretexts are put forward to justify an attack which has no other real ground than the interests of our imperial pride and commercial greed.

In the face of all this, we who watch with shame and sorrow the action of England in the East can but reiterate our just demands. They are as ever: the recognition of the claims of others, the application in the East of the principles which guide our policy in the West, the cherishing of every independent state, the abstention from all force—from all

domineering of the stronger over the weaker powers—from all assertion of the interests of England to the contempt of the legitimate pretensions of others. Specifically we should say—conduct the negotiations with Burmah as you would with any European Power; let no force be sent, no unworthy threats uttered, no acceptance of dependence required, no control enforced, no Resident with an armed force imposed. We ask, in fact, no more and no less than such conduct as self-respect and the respect for justice and morality render imperative on a strong and civilized nation.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

55 PALACE GARDENS TERRACE,
1 *Descartes*, 97 (24 October, 1885.)

P.S.—If I have made no mention of the possible difficulty with France, it is because I would rest my appeal entirely on the merits of the case—not because I am blind to the very serious evil consequences of our action in two respects as regards the French and other Governments. I mean first the bitterness which may result from our persistence in our aggression; secondly, the encouragement it gives to the existing deplorable tendency of the Western nations to aggrandise themselves at the expense of the weaker organisations of Asia and Africa.

HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

SERMON I.

With all centres of our faith, more especially with our common centre in Paris ; with all its scattered disciples ; with the members of all other religious organisations or beliefs, Monotheist, Polytheist, or Fetichist, all lesser distinctions being absorbed in the one bond of community of religious aim ; with the whole human race ; with man, that is, wherever found and in whatever condition, again all lesser distinctions being absorbed in the one bond of our common humanity ; and with the animal races which during the long effort of man to raise himself, have been, as they still are, his companions and helpers, we, on this occasion, on this Festival of Humanity, would be in conscious sympathy.

Nor with our contemporaries alone are we in sympathy, but even more with the larger portion of the race which constitutes the Past. We gratefully commemorate the services of all the generations whose labour we inherit and wish to hand down with increase to our successors. We acknowledge the sway of the Dead.

We gratefully commemorate also the services of our common mother, the Earth, the planet which is our home, and with her the orbs which form the solar system, our world. We may not separate from this last commemoration that of the milieu in which that system moves, the Space which has ever been of great service to man, and is destined to be of greater, by his wise use, as it becomes the recognised seat of abstraction, the seat of the higher laws which collectively constitute the Destiny of man, and is introduced as such in all our intellectual and moral training.

From the Present and the Past we extend our sympathies to the Future, to the unborn generations which, with happier lot, shall follow us on this earth ; the thought of whom

should be constantly present to our minds, in order to complete the conception of Humanity, as revealed to man by the Founder of our Religion, by the full recognition of the continuity which is her noble characteristic. The memory of her greatest servant, Auguste Comte, finds a fitting place in this her greatest Festival, consecrated as it is by its very idea to the remembrance of all her servants, known or nameless—to the remembrance of all the results they have achieved and by which they live.

Wisest and noblest of teachers ! may all of us who avow ourselves thy disciples, animated by thy example, supported by thy doctrine, guided by thy construction, face all the obstacles which indifference or hostility throws in our way, and in the midst of this revolutionary age, undebased by any hope of reward, undeterred by any ill success of our efforts, in a spirit of submissive veneration, carry forward the great work to which thy life was devoted—the work of human regeneration.

I break this year with my usual practice. I shall not enter on any review of Positivist action or progress during the past year, nor on any examination of our present condition and prospects ; nor will I detain you with my reasons for the change. Without preliminary, I proceed with the main body of my discourse, approaching in my own way its principal object. Any other points on which I may touch will be kept in subservience to this object, so that I shall be free from any obligation to attempt an exhaustive examination of any of them.

The conflict of opinion certainly grows more animated and more distracting to the observer. The main current sets more visibly in the direction of religious discussion, the political and even the social questions of importance taking a subordinate position. There is endless confusion—but this seems the general result. It must be so. As the old order disappears, that which alone gives it so much of coherent existence as it retains, must be exposed to more searching discussion, and the question of the substitute, of the new order which is to take its place, must assume greater promi-

nence. But the destructive process is as yet the most evident, so few recognising that it is a destructive process, that there is any need of a substitution—the greater number bent only on such changes as are consistent with the retention substantially of the existing state of things. In the conviction that this state of things is in principle to continue, they boldly work away, contributing most useful aid, though admirably unconscious of it, towards its elimination. Certainly if destruction were all that is needed, the enemies of what is might leave the task in the hands of its professed and honestly professed friends.

The past year has brought no peaceful settlement of the difficulties which, at its opening, disturbed the existence of mankind. Scarcely any trace of an advance even to a settlement can be found, and it has brought many new difficulties with it. It would be hard to show that we are not worse off at its end than at its beginning. We may have a certain faith that we are not so, because we may be convinced that the mere lapse of time is bearing us onward to better things, but not much more than this general belief can be attained. And against it we have to set the growing sense of hopelessness, the disheartening consequent on the absence of any appearance of firm land in the midst of the chaos. Where is the disorder to be stayed? This applies to all the larger subjects of human interest, political, social, or religious; it applies, that is, to the mutual attitude of the great states of Europe—where all is in question—to the relations of the different classes in society, the struggle between capital and labour, evidently not conducted with less bitterness—to the contest of religious beliefs, for there too is much to indicate an increase of tension, if not of asperity, nothing to indicate any conclusive termination of the countless problems started. The abundance of matter, however, does not make choice easy. It must be made, however; so, turning from what may seem the more immediate interests, I endeavour to-day to treat one of the more general, which will be seen to be in closest contact with the more immediate, but which rises above them—a question which, if settled, would satisfy them, whereas, whilst it remains unsettled, nothing but a temporary and unstable satisfaction is attainable. The constitution of

the Spiritual Power in the Religion of Humanity is the subject on which I wish to fix your attention—a subject, it will be allowed, in fullest consonance with the festival of to-day.

The direction of the world's movement is towards Catholicism, that is, towards an universal religion, or, in other words, towards an unity satisfying fully man's moral and spiritual nature. This has been the unconscious aspiration of mankind ever since the earliest beginnings of any higher social existence. As other great ideas, it has emerged at times with distinctness, at times has been thrown back into obscurity, but at all times, whether acknowledged or hidden, it has been gathering strength, and advancing towards its realisation. This conviction is firmly rooted in us by the teachings of social science, by its doctrines as to order equally as by its doctrines as to progress. Any unity short of this religious unity is insecure and ineffectual, is but a temporary bond of more or less utility to those who share it, more or less serviceable or dangerous to those who stand outside it. Try the various bonds which have claimed to unite men, or which assert their pretensions in the present, and it will be seen that one after the other they fail of their end. They have their use under the control of the religious idea; when alien to it, they may still have some use, but there lurks in them an element of disunion, if not of oppression.

So far all religious minds might be agreed. Passing over the very commonly received notion that any such religious unity is a dream in this present state, and can only be attained in a future existence, the question arises, Shall this Catholicism be the child of theological belief, or of a belief absolutely non-theological; shall it be a Roman or Human Catholicism? For I imagine none here will object to the apparent narrowing of the question involved in the word Roman. We all feel that it is the result of all historical study, that if any form of theology can bind the race together, it is that which it assumes in the teachings of the Romish Church.

This then is the broad issue that fronts us. From it we judge and we deal with all the various issues. I have stated it in its most general form—not binding it down to an

exclusive connection with our own faith ; taking into account, that is, those who, accepting the human side, are not disciples of the Religion of Humanity, as we preach it, but still look for the promise of its coming—look, and we hope look not without some anxious striving to hasten that coming. For I would remind them of the words of one whom they in general honour, that ‘when the philosophic minds of the world can no longer believe its religion, or can only believe it with modifications amounting to an essential change of its character, a transitional period commences, of weak convictions, paralyzed intellects, and growing laxity of principle, which cannot terminate until a renovation has been effected in the basis of their belief, tending to the evolution of some faith, whether religious, or as we should say, theological, or merely human, which they can really believe; and when things are in this state, all thinking or writing which does not tend to promote such a renovation is of very little value beyond the moment.’ (Mill—*Autobiography*, p. 239).

But this is by the way. To those who are disciples of the Religion of Humanity as proclaimed by Auguste Comte, and to such I am now speaking, the points of practical interest in regard to Roman Catholicism are : the estimate of its actual strength, and an examination of the sources of such strength, of the means by which it has recovered and retains so much power. We seek to supersede it, and may find it useful to understand what we would supersede. But it is only incidentally that I shall touch on such points—anything more would be impossible on such an occasion. I wished to place in presence of one another the two contending faiths which, mutually exclusive, claim the task of organising human existence, and having done so, I might proceed to my special subject, the consideration of one, and that the most important instrument for ensuring the triumph of our own faith.

But though mutually exclusive, the two faiths touch one another, as has been rightly seen, in many respects, and therefore it is that I have accepted the term Human Catholicism as a designation of the Religion of Humanity. In a sense they have their end in common, they have common difficulties and common enemies. They have, therefore, in

the present day, to deal with the same questions, though naturally with some of them in a very different degree. This follows from the different period of existence which they have severally reached. With due allowance for such difference, the attitude assumed by the one towards this or that immediate problem may be examined in order to throw light on that which should be assumed by the other, or the comparison of their divergent methods may give us a means of judging of their relative prospects.

With these objects, and because on these occasions I have generally endeavoured to handle some of the topics of present interest, I shall select two or three of the more prominent, and, I repeat, without the slightest pretension to treat them fully, but adapting them to the purposes of this discussion.

I spoke of the Romish Church as having recovered her power, and the language is justified if we compare her position actually with what it was at the close of the last century. There is no need to over-estimate her strength, but certainly, at the period just mentioned, few even of the most thoughtful observers would have predicted that it would be as great as it is, and that, be it remembered, without any decided process of internal renovation. She has, as it has been said, furbished up her old armour, with here and there a slight development. Complete as is our opposition to that Church, it is difficult to refuse a certain admiration to the courage with which she has faced adverse times, to the firm self-reliance which leads her to re-state, and not diminish, her claims, to tighten, not relax, the bond of her communion, to provoke rather than conciliate those who find difficulties in her doctrines. I doubt not the wisdom of her policy on a given assumption. Nor can we doubt its immediate success. The disquiet it occasions in Europe is a proof of it. The vigorous concentration of the Papal power, which is the essence of Ultramontaniam, is seen by the public men of Europe, especially of Protestant Europe, to be fraught with grave consequences to that which they represent, the power of the State as they at present conceive that term. And in their several ways they address themselves to meet the difficulty. So that we are threatened with a revival of the

medieval struggles between the ecclesiastical and civil powers; and there is not less confusion and perplexity now than there was of old, owing to the hybrid character of both the combatants. Any Christian state, Protestant or Catholic, is sore bested in point of logic in its resistance to the Church, there being a common ground which cannot be wholly ignored. On the other hand, the Romish Church is cumbered with its non-spiritual claims, its temporal power, and its wealth. Neither wishes to push matters to their logical extremities, and to find in the utter severance of the two their respective freedom. It is on any ground hitherto admitted an insoluble problem how to reconcile the two parties in the dispute, as is evident when we consider the ultimate battle-field on which they must meet—or have already met—the field of what is called education. I put aside all minor differences of belief, and all temporary qualifications of my statement, and broadly assert that Education, in its limited sense of instruction, as in its truest sense, is not, and can never be, a function of the temporal power—of the State—and yet to make it so is unquestionably the direction of State efforts here as elsewhere; and to make it so is, it must be allowed, the logical development of that strict subordination of the Church to the State, which has been under different conditions the common object of modern statesmen as a rule. We can understand their action by a reference to the complications with which they have been in contact; but if we accept its error in principle, we cannot doubt that that error will reveal itself ultimately.

The conclusion is that the complete triumph of either side is out of the question—that the conflict as at present conducted is interminable—terrible as is the prospect for the peace of Europe and the welfare of mankind. Both powers are in fact too strongly organised for it to be possible for either directly to crush the other. It is a dreary waste of time and energy which we have to contemplate, whilst the superannuated doctrines in actual possession of the West grind one another to powder.

With the doctrines, as doctrines, we cannot take part, nor generally with the action on either side; yet there is, I think, a certain difference in our estimate of the two disputants.

Our opposition to the Roman Catholic Church is, I have said, thorough and uncompromising; but we have more agreement with her in the principle of her claims than with her antagonist; all we wish is that the principle stood out more purely. And whilst denying her pretensions, and seeking to wrest from her grasp whatever direction she still wields, we cannot but honour her testimony against the narrow spirit of state isolation which at all times, since she fell from her supreme power, has been a curse to Europe, and now, in the hour before its final disappearance, is exerting with fresh intensity its baleful influence. It is something that there exists, however weakened and degraded, a church which reminds men of an universal bond, not of a vague, speculative belief, but of an organisation of life and practice, overriding all national and local separation. And it is her superiority in this respect which ensures her continuance, let the temporal powers do what they like, till such time as some analogous organisation succeed in establishing its claim to satisfy the wants of human nature.

We, too, the representatives of Human Catholicism, have to speak and act with energy in this same direction, and whilst the traditional ideas of State Policy preserve their power, we shall be in opposition, in some degree, with the State action. But as the conception of the State is modified into greater harmony with the industrial civilisation of the future, this opposition will tend to disappear, which cannot be said of our predecessor. Both purely social, both purely human, the spiritual and the temporal powers can move in the same general direction, distinguished from one another most prominently by their difference of extension—the first being universal, the second local. All the just requirements of the civil order the Church can accept and support, and in the interests of freedom be grateful for, whereas the recognised ecclesiastical organisations find it difficult to do so, as is evidenced by the Roman Catholic hostility to civil marriage.

Leaving this comparison of their attitude towards the State, the two Catholicisms have a common point of interest in their relations to that which, for want of a better term, I call the power of science, as commonly understood. This power, as it at present exists, has a disposition to lend its aid in the

struggle on which I have just touched, to the State; and in return it expects to receive, does receive, encouragement and support, and will probably receive more in the immediate future. It is inherently hostile to the theological Catholicism, whatever degree of co-existence may be found possible, but its hostility is directed against its belief; and it is hostile to the successor of Catholicism with probably a more bitter and conscious hostility, but its hostility cannot be so much directed against its belief as against the organisation which issues from that belief.

For here is the peculiarity of the position—that with the power of science we have much in common, and with the Romish Church we have much in common, and yet perhaps both dislike us more than they do each other; and the latter, I believe, is fully aware that we are a far more formidable opponent in principle than the other. I can only indicate certain bearings of this great and most interesting question. Rome may feel that the power of science, as at present conceived, and have we not the confession of it openly made, can never supersede her, hardly ventures to wish it, for it is, as at present, but in incomplete possession of the whole field of scientific knowledge. Rome, therefore, may watch with comparative composure the approach of an enemy who leaves her main stronghold unassailed, the province unoccupied within whose limits she exercises some, if almost negative, direction. But the case is different when she is attacked by those who occupy as their peculiar possession that province—claim as the proper field of human science the social and moral existence of man—value highly the lower sciences, but value them as stepping-stones to these higher—and cannot admit that, if they stop short of the completeness they gain by this position of dependence, they have any claim to the direction of the world. We have properly no controversy with science, whatever its present accepted representatives may say; we only wish it to work its full work—to accept in all its difficulty the task that devolves on it of contributing, by its own self-completion, to the social and moral growth of Humanity, to renounce all other and vaguer aspirations, and determine itself by a constant reference to this one supreme end, so attaining an unity which it vainly persists in seeking

outside Humanity. It is evident the Roman Church can use no such language; and as unable to use it, we may see that the strife between her and science can only end in her destruction; whereas, as we advance towards our goal, whatever temporary discord there may be disappears of necessity, and the conclusions of science merge almost imperceptibly in the religious faith of mankind,—its permanent, accepted, unassailable foundation.

Another point of comparison in the position of the two faiths is their respective attitude to that which I may call inorganic religion, grouping under that term all the looser forms of religious belief which are relatively indifferent to any organisation—the Theism, the belief in the unknowable, &c. Such doctrines stand in the way of both the Catholicisms, but the instinct of the older may be trusted to reach the conclusion that they stand less in her way than in ours. They appear to grant but little; but when taken in combination with their negative aspect, that little is of great importance; and in the period when the two real rivals come more openly into presence, it will be found to be so, and their adherents will more easily take sides with Rome than with us. Meanwhile they hasten the destruction of the existing order, and perhaps still more effectually impede the construction of the new. The older faith cannot successfully contend with them, for they are the expression of its intellectual unsatisfactoriness; the younger has not yet attained sufficient credence to set them aside, though its power to do so is not wholly unrecognised.

View the matter under all its aspects—in respect to Church and State, to theology and science, to dogmatic Theology and residual Theology—we may see, I think, ground for the conclusion that the direction of men's minds has lapsed, so far as the Roman Catholic Church is concerned—fallen from her hands as too weak to retain it. The hope that her faith may be the faith of the race can be hardly cherished by any of her communion. And yet, whilst barely concealing her abandonment of this hope, as she utters her anathemas against the multiple forms of error which render its realisation impossible, and which no anathemas can remove or make innocuous, the Romish Church confidently

assumes her own eternal existence with a faith as unquestioning as ever animated her predecessor, the Rome of the Cæsars, in the height of her power.

It is unquestionably her hierarchical organisation which is the secret of this confidence of the Roman Catholic Church. Her creed may no longer command assent—her discipline may be undermined. We can see that in all directions she is in danger, as her recent utterances show that she sees. But when all other human societies stand so separate from one another, she alone offers the spectacle of an outward union penetrating into all portions of the world, and her Pontiff can gather around him what may seem to deserve, in a sense, the name of an œcumenical council. The dignitaries who composed it were the representatives of believers under the most diverse conditions, and, as such, when gathered together, must have infused into one another the conviction of a still real and great power. They know, as all know, the amount of unreality there lies under the semblance, still even the semblance is imposing, and implies more, both in aspiration and effect, than any other spiritual organisation has attained. And whatever misgivings there may be as to the final result of her efforts, however weakened the conditions on which she rests, torn though she may be by dissensions and assailed by the action of unbelief among her own members, can we doubt that as her nobler spirits survey the whole state of things around them, there is much to justify them in the faith that their Church, and no other organisation among men, can offer this toiling and suffering humanity union and peace. Such a belief may well bind them together under all difficulties, and so bound, their numbers and their discipline are calculated to give them courage. Were it not for the incurable weakness of the doctrine it teaches, the Roman hierarchy, concentrated as it now is, might well look for the restoration of more than its mediæval supremacy.

It is for us and our successors, with a stronger doctrine, to forge an instrument of equal, nay superior potency for the support, direction, and propagation of the Religion of Humanity, to create a new Priesthood capable of accomplishing the task which has proved above the strength of the old—the unifying of the Human Race. On this creation, as from

year to year we are reminded by a passage from Auguste Comte, chosen as the motto of the annual circular, depends as on an indispensable condition the whole movement of regeneration.

But more than any other point in our system, this it is which excites alarm and distrust, even in quarters where there is visibly a true social feeling. It may not therefore be a waste of time if I speak at some length on it to-day, endeavouring so to present it as to show its necessity and to strip it of some of the dangers which seem to many minds inherent in it.

With this aim, I will touch on the whole question of the spiritual power, of which the priesthood is but one constituent, in some respects, it may be, the most important, but not the highest—not the most universal.

Without entering into the constitution of the planet on which we live, and the analogies which it presents to the constitution of man's world, it is clear that in relation to the sum of external forces which are man's natural environment, his intelligent will plays the part of a spiritual power—a power that is under the control of those forces, weaker than they, but able in its weakness to modify them, and in some cases to subdue them to be ministers to his purposes. In man himself, the individual man, apart from all social considerations, we trace the same distinction. One part of his nature rules him with an almost tyrannic rule till another part, in itself weaker, is enabled by culture to assert its influence, and gradually tempers the sway of the other, tends to invert the relation between the two, and become the superior and controlling force. We are familiar with the doctrine of the relative weakness of the unselfish instincts, of their capacity for assuming the governance of the selfish. I have alluded to it for completeness' sake, as showing how early in our study of man we come on this question of a division of two powers, the one stronger and harsher in character, required to meet the circumstances in which the race finds itself, but liable to degenerate into mere brutality, the other gentler but able to exert a most beneficial influence. In this sense, each man may be said to be a priest unto himself, and it is this which has led to the notion, so prevalent

under a great variety of forms, that no external interference is needed, no special organisation, but that men may be left to the development of their nature, certain in freedom to attain the right result. It is forgotten, I believe, that the possibility of entertaining this notion is due to the long practical insistence on the contradictory—that to the enforced discipline of unnumbered generations we owe it that we can with any degree of safety tolerate on a limited scale its experimental adoption. Only in society can man assert his place as the highest of animals—apart from the restraints of society, from law and justice, he is the worst of them all—is the severe but true judgment of Aristotle. I quote it as most useful at the present time, when the truth of the estimate on which it rests is so often made, as it were, palpable in practice, so often at the same time contested in theory.

So far for the individual and the dualism which he exemplifies, and the object of that dualism. On a larger scale we find all that we have said of it applicable to social man. The exigencies of his position call out the harder qualities, foster the activity and strongly stimulate the selfishness of his nature, and the prevailing bias of social forces is consequently to the outward, the material result. This is equally true whichever of the two forms of human action be in the ascendant. In this general statement lies the justification of the alleged necessity for some spiritual power in the abstract—some power which may modify that bias and eventually substitute a different one.

In short, the existence of such a power is one of the necessary conditions of any tolerable human society, and may be traced much lower than man in the animal world. In one form or other it has been universal in man wherever we have knowledge of him in society. In his highest civilisation, all the forms in which it has been found coexist and combine, and it is in this combined state that it will be most convenient to look at them, to analyse the spiritual power of actual life into its constituents, and treat them one by one in the order, with one exception, of their universality.

What, then, is the most universal constituent of this composite Spirituality? The answer is clear. It is in woman

that we find it ; and therefore it is that, as the most universal and the most powerful of all modifying agents, woman is in our religion the representative of Humanity. One half of the human race, an essential element of each human family, weaker in bodily strength, she has, in the association of the two sexes for securing the objects of human existence, taken the more passive, more dependent part ; and as the consequence of all this, she has both unconsciously and consciously, but in either case unintermittingly, exercised a powerful influence over her stronger and more active associate. With the gradual advance of the race that influence has increased in extent and intensity—her functions have become more important and more distinctly recognised, her position has been raised, her existence has been sheltered. The whole current of civilisation has set in her favour ; as a summary expression of this may be taken the final recognition of her place as the supreme agent in the education of man, when we use that term in its completest, noblest sense. The highest instruction she is not competent to give—that requires its own peculiar organ, but that after all is a minor subject—and in the formation of man as a proper member of the social whole, the greatest share is reserved for woman. She surrounds the infant with her love, and trains it in those early impressions which are so large a part of ourselves and our lives, she trains the child, softens and disciplines the youth, nor ceases to modify, refine, and purify the man throughout the whole of his existence. I am speaking, you will observe, of women solely in reference to one particular function, treating of one constituent of the composite Spiritual Power which directs the race, to the exclusion of other points. If we admit this educational function for women, one inference is incontestable. Those who are to contribute so largely to education must themselves be educated in the highest conceivable way. No pains can be too great for this object. It can be but a question of means and methods ; the end is beyond the reach of dispute. In much of the language that we hear on this subject we then agree ; we too wish as ardently as any for the higher education of women. It remains to be seen in what sense the term is used, but this is not my present object.

The second most universal constituent of the spiritual power we find in the elders, the old men, one of the earliest institutions of Humanity; and one necessarily permanent, requiring only definite recognition and certain arrangements to perfect it. In order of time it precedes the priesthood, of which it is the germ, or, you may say, the earliest spontaneous form. And when the course of things has brought about the separation of a body more directly qualified for the priestly office, the old still remains a valuable auxiliary to the new power, as well adapted to propagate its influence throughout the society. It is one of the peculiar features of our religion that it provides, on this peculiar head, the required arrangements. A sacrament consecrates the retirement from active life of those who have been engaged in it for the thirty-five years following on its adoption—a sacrament applying to rich and poor alike. Such an institution implies a function for the old freely accepted; in other words, a duty. Relieved from the daily pressure of active exertion they enter upon a period of repose, where they may look back with satisfaction on their past services, without feeling that all service is at an end with them. The valuable gift of their calm experience it is yet in their power to give, and as they have now no temptation, or comparatively none, to partiality, there need attach no suspicion to its expression. Add to this that the force of opinion so generated will be due to the whole body of the old, composed necessarily in major part of the old taken from the poorer, so that any class feeling which might be expected still to show itself, will be toned down in a milieu where rich and poor meet on a footing of essential equality. In the industrial contests which, from time to time, will be sure to arise, this natural court of arbitrators may intervene with the best results, co-operating most usefully with the Priesthood. But this is not the only function of the old. They too take a part in education, aiding greatly in that which is given strictly within the home circle, by the impalpable but certain and unresisted influence which age has over the young; prolonging and strengthening the direct parental action, often softening it by virtue of their more tempered view of life and character; aiding also in the theoretic training given by the priest, by encouragement, by support, often by assistance in the com-

monest sense ; aiding, lastly, during the period when the decision is being made as to what shall be the life chosen. Throughout it will be allowed that the function assigned the old is a spiritual one, and that its acceptance and performance will redeem that period of life from many of the evils which too frequently press upon it ; above all, from the cardinal evil of an undignified and purposeless existence. Looked forward to and prepared during all the previous stages, this last stage may be made the crown of our earthly life—the peaceful and honoured portal to our incorporation into Humanity.

In order of universality the Priesthood should come next, as in order of importance it would precede the last mentioned constituent. But, for the sake of greater clearness, I prefer to take it later, after giving some attention to that which thus becomes the third element of the spiritual power, the Proletariate, a term which is now sufficiently familiar to all.

It is, of course, only under one aspect that the Proletariate can be so considered, yet the general tendency of Positivist thought on this subject is to give prominence to this aspect, and to throw comparatively into the background the coarser, commoner, more material view, which is embodied in the term working-classes, and which fixes on their industrial function as the paramount one. There are many indications of a change in this respect, of a movement on the same line as our own efforts towards the social view, as opposed to the purely industrial view of the Proletariate. The full assertion of this, the full examination of the functions and duties of this important portion of society, would best come from itself in the first place, and I cherish the hope that it will yet come in a complete shape. But, meanwhile, I must, for my present object, say a few words in explanation of the conception stated above. Two general considerations will be sufficient.

In the first place a little reflection will show that, in a regime in which the moral power, the power of opinion, is the one on which reliance is placed, the immense preponderance in number of the Proletariate gives it a corresponding preponderance in respect to this power. Educated, in the highest sense of the term, prepared to accept all the duties and responsibilities which rest on it as the strongest social

element, the force of which it will dispose in aid of the conclusions reached by reason will be incalculable. Public opinion may come to be practically its opinion—a change of the greatest moment—as we can see by the occasional effects even at present of its opinion.

In the second place, this enormous preponderance in numbers gives the Proletariate the largest stake in the welfare of society, and naturally, therefore, constitutes it the ally of that power which most consistently and scientifically studies the general welfare, and with which moreover it is in no direct collision of interests. Lastly, by its disengagement from the more special objects of men's pursuit, it has, when considered under its social aspect, an affinity with the strictly Spiritual Power, which is by its nature universal and not special. The fourth division of the Proletariate is typical in this respect, and hence one great reason for its introduction into our system. The mendicant class is essentially invested with spiritual functions and represents the limit to which the Proletariate tends in this direction. It may serve to illustrate my meaning if I remind you that, in the *Antiquary*, the most direct spiritual action is attributed to Edie Ochiltree when he interferes to warn the two young soldiers of the guilt of duelling.

I do not forget, however, that this is but one aspect of the case, that imperative necessities impose other and most important duties on the great class I am considering. There is no fear of this escaping notice. The danger lies the other way, and especially does it so lie in a society so strongly industrial as our own, where the one absorbing interest seems to be material production. It is to mitigate the evils of this absorption, to lessen the inhuman sacrifice of higher objects which it involves, that it is incumbent on us, at all seasonable occasions, to press such moral and non-industrial considerations as those on which I have been insisting.

I come now to the question of the Priesthood—that element of the Spiritual Power which excites the most opposition—the very name being a stumblingblock to most Englishmen, even allowing for the removal of some of the hostility in consequence of the growth in recent years of church feeling. The unreasoning hatred to any priesthood is, however, domi-

nant, and the general language would still be that it is alien to any progress, as it has always been. What those who hold such a view seriously make of the history of man's advance hitherto, it is difficult to say. Any real study of that history must show the large debt of gratitude we owe to the priestly corporations which in various countries have guided their respective populations. The notion popularly prevalent to the contrary is but a revolutionary growth, deriving a certain systematic support from the theories of Protestant Christianity—as such it will pass away with the revolution.

It will be as well, however, to examine a question which rises in many minds. Granting that in the past the institution of a priesthood has had its use and justification, have we not outgrown it—is it a permanent necessity? It may be shown to be so, I think. It would be, perhaps, enough to show that man never has really been able to dispense with it, and that this is as true of the present day in Europe, as of any other period or country. Let any one, after listening to the strongest denunciation of the Priesthood of Humanity, and such is easily accessible to him, observe carefully the actual state of things around him, in this country for instance, where, if anywhere, there is an unpriestly tone of mind, and he will find that no such tone of mind gets rid of a real priestly power—apart from all church organisations—and in some measure stronger than all—apart also from the claims of the men of special science—such power being represented by that peculiar institution, the irresponsible and anonymous newspaper press.

But I prefer to take another line of argument, and I would ask this question: Are there not at least two functions of society which require a priesthood under some name or other, the reality under whatever form may be given it? It is possible that there are more than two. We shall see reason to think that there are, but for the present it will be sufficient if I establish two or even one. It seems, then, undeniable that in the future, to meet the growing requirements and difficulties of the human organism in its largest extension, co-extensive that is with the habitable globe, there will be needed a higher instruction, given to all men, than anything which has previously been attempted. Such an instruction

in its universal form cannot be given by the family, as the largest number of families cannot possibly have their heads disposable for such instruction by the mere fact of insufficient leisure. It is conceivable that a low average of superficial instruction might be given in the family, after, that is, a long course of preparation even for this smaller result. But the higher teaching which man more and more requires will always necessitate a special body set apart for it, so at least it appears to me. If, as in the past, such higher teaching is to continue the portion of the few, that would alter the question, but we who claim it for every human being alike, and who claim what is involved in such a statement, that it shall be offered freely for his acceptance, can see no means of attaining this result but in the existence of a specially qualified body, organised on such a scale as to permit its discharge of this universal and most onerous social obligation. If such a body is up to its work, it will inevitably assume at one time or other the attitude of a priesthood, and assume it with the full sanction of those whom it teaches.

The permanence of this function of the higher intellectual training rests on the simple condition of our social existence that it is in a constant state of decomposition and recomposition, new generations of the young and untrained ever rising to take the places left vacant for them.

It will perhaps be said, we want no priesthood for this, but a body of state-appointed teachers under the control of the civil power. It might begin so, but could hardly continue so. In all the higher sciences, freedom of teaching is incompatible with state-control, or, if compatible, would generally place the teachers in the position of priests, that is to say of men invested with a certain spiritual direction. In the lower sciences, physics or chemistry for example, there is no objection now to complete freedom of expression, and hence they find it easier to live on good terms with the State and the State with them.

Intimately connected with the consideration of successive generations is the second social function, to which I appeal as by general assent hitherto recognised as an attribute of a priesthood—the consecration of some of the stages of our existence. It matters not for the principle how few or how many. The

intervention of the civil power in this respect will not ultimately supersede the action of the religious. We here quarrel not with that intervention—we accept it and think it both wholesome and indispensable; but we are not, therefore, any more than our predecessors, bound to consider it as sufficient. And as religion gains more sway over the feelings and actions of men, as the religious union once again passes into its just supremacy in their estimation, all will desire that the various events of life which have a certain prominence should meet with some express recognition on the part of the religious society. And it is but natural to suppose that some functionaries will be required to give such recognition. In other words, the sacraments of the new Church are in as strict a connection, whatever the difference of ground, with an organised Priesthood, as were the sacraments in the Catholic Church.

With these remarks, I abandon the defensive. It is but an accident of the revolutionary character of our present thought, that on such a subject such a line is even for a moment necessary. The several constituents of the spiritual power above enumerated stand in need of a centralising and impelling force; only under its direction can they each of them answer their full purpose. This we might learn from observation of the present time, when there is so much that is good in opinion and in act, and with so very poor a result, owing mainly to the absence of direction. Assuming, then, that the Priesthood is a permanent want of the race, what are its functions?

One, and the capital one, has been already touched on: the imparting, that is, the higher intellectual training; this in the hands of a competent body is an educational function of the highest order. Its due performance of this service is the primary foundation on which rest the whole existence and influence of the Priesthood of Humanity. This has been often dwelt on. I content myself with naming it now. Nor will I detain you on the subject of its teaching, nor do more than state the condition that it is to be open to all gratuitously, and can never claim any monopoly. It must rely on its own intrinsic superiority for its power to supersede other teaching.

But if it discharge its office rightly, it is certain that its

influence will be great over those whom it has taught. Its admitted competence will give it acknowledged weight in counsel. Its second or consultative function thus becomes a simple consequence of its first. The generations which have owed to it their training will recur to it in seasons of difficulty for guidance.

Again, they who have felt its competence in all the highest subjects of human life, its competence in explaining to them the laws of their animal, social, and moral existence will be ready to welcome it as the administrator of the sacraments which regulate that existence, which are the special applications of the general principles.

Again, there is the function of judgment so inherent in the social organisation, performed with such different success at different times. It requires for its right performance a priesthood with a real hold on all that is requisite for judgment, intellectually and morally. The importance of this function it asks of us some exertion to realise. We all easily admit the importance of legal judgments in our social life; they are seen to be indispensable. Not less may be said of the moral judgments which, without distinct recognition, are ever being formed and expressed. Sooner or later they translate themselves into action, and some great social change is, half unexpectedly even to the most thoughtful, their result. As a sufficient instance, take the question of transportation, where a national practice was quietly changed by virtue of a change in the moral judgment of the nation. But it may be well to follow up this question by some further remarks.

It is in the exercise of this function of judgment that the priesthood will usefully intervene on a point where much intervention is needed. The material wants of human society lead to a large amount of social inequality. The great variety, that is, of work to be done, leads to a great variety in the agents who have to do it; and this variety is followed as a natural consequence, in the ordinary undirected course of things, by a corresponding variety in social estimation. I wish to avoid all but the quietest statement on this subject. But no society has yet existed in which there has not been an excess of disrespect of the lower and more numerous

classes, a depreciation of the labourer in the strictest sense. As our Western civilisation advances, this evil becomes more injurious socially, alienating, as it does, by contempt on the one side, soreness on the other, the two great constituents of society. We none of us perhaps bring home to ourselves with sufficient force the danger latent in this state of things—this sentimental grievance as the inhuman cynicism of the day would call it. A corrective is needed, and no corrective can be found but in a change of the social judgment on the question. I have little doubt it is slowly changing, but to one who will weigh the forces in presence, it will be clear that the change wants impulse, system, and expression. And I can see no quarter to which we can look for these but to the spiritual power in our religion; and most of course to its most proper organ, the Priesthood. It is impossible not to see that the other clergies have no value in this matter. They, from a series of complex considerations, stand, as a rule, on the side of the dominant classes in society, and look with suspicion, as having a Jacobinical tendency, on all real attempts to redress the balance. It is reserved for us, and for us alone, to give due weight to what there is legitimate in the democratic aspirations of the present and succeeding generations, by a right direction of the judgment of society on this most important question of the relative social consideration of its various members, ensuring to all a due measure of such consideration.

One other function, possibly a development merely of those already given—I stop not to enquire—attaches to the Priesthood by virtue of its whole constitution. It has to plead for all that cannot plead for itself—I purposely use this form of expression in order to gain the utmost possible comprehensiveness. It has to plead, that is, for the weak, whatever be the form or source of their weakness; for the oppressed, whoever be the oppressor. It pleads in its own name and as the representative, the voice of its spiritual associates. It is no merely scientific body watching quietly the operation of some law of natural selection; it has, with temperate wisdom, to direct the reaction of man against the rigours of his destiny. It has to plead the cause of our posterity, of the unborn generations whose welfare is so largely dependent on the

action of the existing. It speaks to the Present in the interest of the Future as that which should be of paramount importance in its eyes, controlling all its policy, and making it refuse alleviations of urgent evils when such alleviations can be shown to be fraught with noxious consequences for our successors. It pleads again for the animal world, not merely in its weakness or to obviate oppression as commonly understood—to mitigate the cruelty of man towards his animal helpers—this case would come under a former statement. I mean something more than this; I mean the careful consideration of the use we make of the animals, of the limits which there are to our dealing with them as the means of additional power, as the sources of our food, and, I may add here, as verifications of our scientific knowledge. Even more; there is danger in the reckless pursuit of immediate profit for the gratification of our vanity or our appetites, lest many of the animal races which contribute so usefully to the wants of man be prematurely extirpated by our blind action; and the danger is the greater, as the several nations feel no common interest in the matter. It will be for a Priesthood with universal ramifications to plead the interest of the race, and to promote community of action in securing protection where it is needed. The same applies to the vegetable and mineral world, where grave evils—evils occasionally felt already—are being risked by the neglect of our contemporaries for the interests of the future.

That a Priesthood with such functions, if it be at all worthy of its mission, will have great influence—this needs no argument, but it is important to remember that it is but one constituent of the Spiritual Power as we conceive it, which is not one and simple but composed of many parts, each acting on its co-parts and acted on by them. Thus we get a considerable power of counteraction of any ill tendencies which may lurk in any of them. For instance, the old, who are withdrawn from active life, would naturally modify the extreme rigour of principle to which abstract studies might incline the priest. So, again, the influence of women would be felt in the same direction. Considerations such as these are meant to obviate the alarm inspired by the conception of the Priesthood as standing apart with a monstrous

power for crushing all opposition and interfering with all freedom of growth and opinion. Its real power will be in proportion to its correct interpretation of the wants and aspirations primarily of those whose more immediate organ it is, ultimately through them of the human organism in its widest extension. And if it be the correct interpreter of Humanity to man, I know not on what ground any wish to diminish its influence can rest—I know not any justification for the alarm it inspires. If it be not such an interpreter, it has no support for its influence.

Under what conditions will the Spiritual Power so conceive its sphere of influence—a thing of wondrous subtlety, which ceived, live and move? These are determined by its object. perhaps can hardly be wisely the direct aim of any person—individual or collective. The ordinary penalty at least of its direct pursuit would seem to be a lowering of him who pursues it. In this respect it resembles happiness. At any rate in assigning influence as the sphere of the spirituality, we mean to exclude it from power or command—the dangerous lure which exercises so strong an attraction on all spiritualities. If it is to exert a healthy modifying action on the more material and rougher social forces, it must stand apart from them, and be pure from any rivalry with them. Hence the renunciation of direct government and the renunciation of wealth which we put forward as desirable for all the constituents equally of the Spiritual Power of Humanity, in the degree, that is, in which they enter as constituents, complete, that is, where their participation is complete—incomplete where it is incomplete. For example, the participation of the Proletariate is incomplete, and it therefore retains a certain hold on direct power. With such limitation, this free renunciation is an essential condition, we consider, of all the component parts. Due stress must be laid on the word free, as a necessary part of the conception.

Women, then, the Priesthood, the Old, and the Proletariate, all alike are looked upon as renouncing wealth by their own free determination, and with a view to the better exercise of their proper functions. It may seem absurd to speak of those as renouncing wealth who have none to renounce, nor power to acquire it, and the language may seem to apply only to the

Priest and the Capitalist. It does apply to them more than to the others perhaps—to the retiring Capitalist of course. Yet it is not without interest to remark, that with regard to women, in this country there is a certain movement in favour of their having facilities given them for the acquisition of property, a movement absolutely in the opposite direction to that which we think desirable—a movement which evinces a wish to mix woman up with the practical forces of society, and to impair so far her value as one of the Spiritual. It would be an act of free renunciation if women of their own judgment resisted any such tendency. Again for the Proletariate. It is probable, looking at certain results of the co-operative movement as applied in the production of wealth, that it may become on the part of the Proletariate collectively a deliberate act of renunciation, seeing that the power of acquiring wealth is within their grasp, if they are prepared to sacrifice higher objects to it. If the interests of the whole race, when really studied, are unfavourable to such a direction of their energies, the sense that this power lies in them may, by adding dignity to their resolve not to use such power make its abandonment easier.

So far for one of the material forces hardly separable in an industrial society from power properly so called, as is seen by the cry raised for the suffrage of women of property. With regard to the other, three of the constituents of the spiritual body are looked upon as freely renouncing power—all share, that is, in the government of the State—as the conditions of their influence upon that government. With the old who retire from an active existence this will not be difficult. They have enjoyed power, known what it was, and in all ordinary circumstances will not be sorry, at a given age and with due preparation, to quit it. They will cease to take a directly active part in life. For the Priesthood it is more difficult, especially in a country like this, where the mixture of the temporal and spiritual is of long standing, and the ideas on the subject consequently confused. Yet, in the interest of its real work, the Priesthood will renounce all intervention of a direct kind in the temporal order, limiting itself strictly to the function of advice, in no way aiming at command, a consultative and not a governing body. Should the civil

society invest it with certain powers—such as the suffrage, for instance—it will steadily abstain from using them, so as to preserve the purity of its attitude.

All that applies to these two applies with equal force to the remaining constituent of the spiritual power, *viz.*, to Women, in respect, that is, of the direct possession and use of power. And it would have seemed scarcely necessary to dwell on this but for the continual urging of women's claim to power, which is the offspring partly of the peculiar circumstances of this country, partly of the general revolutionary doctrines as to justice and rights. I will not say more on the subject, leaving it to come under the principles previously laid down, which show that it is by virtue of her higher functions that we wish woman to renounce such lower ones as she might possibly attain.

The Proletariate, as I have said, retains a certain amount of power, but will avail itself of it but sparingly, valuing it but slightly, and in exactly inverse proportion to the estimation in which it holds that which is its true strength, the force of opinion.

So far for the general conditions under which the Spiritual Power is exercised. We are far enough from the possession of such a spirituality. Such of its elements as are permanent and spontaneous necessarily exist amongst us; but we have hardly the germ of that nucleus which is to be the central force of the whole, and which alone can direct to really useful purpose the action of the other parts. Time and thought should be freely bestowed on the means of creating that nucleus. We cannot, however, will its existence, but must wait for its gradual formation, aiding in that formation by the strengthening of the body within which it must be formed,—the body of the disciples of the new Religion.

In the meantime, we constitute, as disciples, a species of collective spiritual power by the force of the doctrine which we believe and live by. That doctrine is thrown into the world as a modifying power; but it cannot have its full effect without the aid of living organs. Such only can bring it to bear on the thousand complications of actual life in a way that shall make it felt. All of us, however different the one from the other, have our share in this work, and in the beginning of

things the share of each is relatively larger than it can be later—if only from the mere difference of numbers. We represent in the face of the world the new doctrine, and we must bear the consequences and not shrink from the responsibilities of our position. We may, imperfectly organised as we are, prove ourselves a real moral force—it requires so few to do that—felt in all the important questions and conjunctures of our times. Doubt it not. Amidst the opposition of the colder intellects, amidst the hesitation of the cautious or the timid, with apparently all the forces of society ranked against us, all its older organisations necessarily adverse to us, there is something on which we can rely. There is a spreading moral dissatisfaction with the opinions and practices now in the ascendant, a craving for a freer introduction of moral considerations into all life, public and private, to which, in the too general, almost universal, silence of our opponents, our teachings alone respond. I have no wish that it should be so, no wish that for our advance others should be silent. I should be glad to welcome any rivalry with us on this point from anybody, Christian or philosophical. I wish we could stimulate the moral activity of the nobler of our opponents. But they are hampered by various difficulties. They who are not so hampered, and can on rational grounds satisfy the above craving, may have a just confidence in their ultimate triumph. Arguments have their use doubtless; but a religious change, such as we are bent on, will require more than anything that is properly called argument. The one all-convincing proof that we and what we represent can direct human life is to direct it, and to give that proof with a gradually increasing force should be the aim of all our efforts. Much may be done, even with our present materials, if we take into account the whole of the body of which we are a part. And the first step in the process is quite within our power. We can make it clear that our religion moulds our own lives and purposes into a consistency and a vigour which we found it impossible to gain from our previous faith.

A writer of the present day uses the following beautiful language: 'If you are persuaded that you have had revealed to you a glorious gospel of light and blessedness, it is impossible not to thirst to impart such tidings most eagerly to those

who are closest about your heart. We are not in that position. We have as yet no magnificent vision so definite, so touching, so "clothed with the beauty of a thousand stars," as to make us eager, for the sake of it, to murder all the sweetnesses of filial piety in an aggressive eristic.' Into the direct purpose of this language I am not bound to enter. I quote it with an object of my own. I cannot say what is the exact force of the 'We,' whom it properly represents,—sufficient that it does not represent us. There have been many, in divers times and countries, on whom in the darkness and discouragement of their actual world, there have dawned fair visions of a brighter future, and who have poured forth their anticipations in words which are the perennial treasure of the race. But be it Hebrew prophet or Christian apostle, martyr of the primitive or saint of the medieval church, poet or seer of whatever faith, to none of them all has it been given to combine the anticipation with the sober certainty in the degree in which it has been given to us. We too shall die in faith as our fathers have died before us,—in a sense *that* will ever be the lot of men, as we dream not of arriving at perfection. But we have seen and may see the promises passing into performance. We are not strangers and pilgrims upon earth, but its citizens, with a definite hold on all that it offers to us, with a distinct consciousness of a work to be done, and of the nature and limits of that work. We know the uncertain tenure under which we work, but we tread none the less firmly because of that uncertainty. If we are silent, it is not because of any defect in the magnificence of the vision, but because we know that the state of those to whom we might speak renders speaking useless. This is the obstacle which is common to us with the great teachers of earlier religion, only to be gradually overcome as they had to overcome it. Common to us and them are also the beauty and the emotions, heightened by the inheritance which they have bequeathed us, by the thrill of sympathy with their faith which we see not to have been in vain. What is peculiar to us is precisely the definiteness of the vision we have, its full rationality, its freedom from vagueness,—and I know not that such qualities impair its power.

Neither do I know, nor do I care to know, whether we

were in the thoughts of one who speaks of the 'notable hardihood of the anti-Christian writing of the day.' I rather ask why we in particular are justified in displaying hardihood. It is because we preach no negation, no unbelief, cannot admit for a moment the appellation of sceptics or unbelievers. We are no such thing. Proud of their being in possession as it were, of their tradition of eighteen centuries, Christian writers may find it convenient to treat all as unbelief simply which is against them. But we have an earlier possession, a longer tradition, in which their's is but a link. The Religion of Humanity absorbs all other partial ones, honours but absorbs them. It is from the vantage ground of a wider and surer faith that we advance against them. They must learn to recognise this alteration in their position. They must learn to understand why it is that we are bold with an unwonted boldness, with a boldness which has apparently no sufficient force to warrant it. They must remember that they began so themselves. We have, as they had at their beginning, the confidence that we have something to offer which is better than what exists. We have not, whatever other weakness we may suffer from, the enfeebling sense of a great amount of failure. Why should we then not be at least as open in asserting the claims of a new and fresh faith as they are with a faith sadly timeworn and undermined?

In these two sources of strength, in the beauty of the conception, in the possession of a real, positive, demonstrable belief, we may find a freedom of utterance such as perhaps we have been somewhat slack in using. They will certainly amply justify the letting our whole life and conversation be permeated by our religious faith. They will justify, I think, more of the Apostolic attitude towards those who are without us than we have hitherto been wont to assume. The treasure we have is of inestimable price, we may not hide it from those whom it might benefit.

SERMON DELIVERED AT THE

POSITIVIST SCHOOL, 19, Chapel Street, Bedford Row, W.C.,

on the Festival of Humanity 87 (1 January, 1875).

HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

SERMON II.*

As shortly as possible I will speak of our action and position, looking back on the last two years. And first, for that part of our work which is least special and positivist. The elementary school is fairly successful. Its aim, as some are aware, is to give strictly elementary instruction, comprising music and drawing. It introduces, and, by its conditions, can introduce nothing beyond. At present there is no musical teaching. This is much to be regretted. The conduct of a singing class open for nine months of the year, from October to June inclusive, which all may attend who will behave quietly, without any payment, and without any promise of regularity; which consequently is constantly varying in composition, and so in numbers and proficiency; with such conditions it is rather a matter of surprise and of gratefulness that we had it conducted with great energy and with good results for two years, than that it was discontinued. I am not without hopes, however, of finding another teacher in sympathy with our general object, though not necessarily a sharer in our belief, who will accept the teaching as part of a general system, and as such regulated as the other parts of the system. From what I saw of the working, I think that, so accepted, the real difficulties would not be without compensation. None of those who work at the school look for great results—in each part there is the same obstacle of uncertainty of attendance—but those who have taught continue with a regularity which deserves every acknowledgment, especially where, as is the case with some, they are only connected with our efforts by the tie of a purely general sympathy. It is one of the great advantages of such an

* The commemorative form given on pp. 225, 226, applies equally to the second sermon.

effort that it enables us to associate with ourselves those who do not belong to our body, but who have time and the wish to co-operate in an useful work, and the union with such is an additional ground for keeping to the original conception of the school as one entirely independent of our religious doctrines.

There might be some who, not able to help in the way of teaching, would be ready to help with money in this particular part of our work, whilst not willing to contribute to the local or the sacerdotal fund. Such help I should accept, and would use if strictly limited to the purposes of the elementary school. It offers, in its complete gratuitousness and in its rigid adherence to the elementary character, the type of the institutions which, at present supported by the public rates, should give all citizens who need aid the aid they require in making themselves masters of the instruments of intellectual training. But any such assistance must be left to the free action of each, not be the result of any pressure.

The same holds good, there is, that is to say, the same appeal to each person's own free initiative, under his personal responsibility, which rightly viewed is not thereby lessened, in regard to contributions made in support of the direct maintenance of this school, the buildings and all that it involves, our place for teaching and for worship. The result of talking over the matter with Mr. Crompton who manages it, is that we do not ask for subscriptions as of necessity. The expenses have been met hitherto, and will be met by those who have taken this obligation upon them. That should be quite understood. But in all such efforts it is wise to rest on as broad a basis as possible. This was felt by Auguste Comte when he said that the sacerdotal fund would then only be on a satisfactory footing when the bulk of it was formed by the minimum subscriptions, the subscriptions of *3s. a-year*. On this ground it might be well for those who are completely with us in wishing to spread the Religion of Humanity, to take some share in the material support of the movement, the amount of such share being left to each, and the gift being considered more as a recognition of the principle above stated than as representing the means or the willingness of the giver.

The subscribers to the central fund are aware of a change in regard to its statement from the annual circular. That fund meets two distinct objects. In the first place, and by the necessity of the case, it meets the charges incident on the execution of M. Comte's will, the maintenance of his apartment and one legacy. I could wish, but it is not possible, that this charge were met by the executors themselves, or with the aid of others grouped around them personally, so as to keep clear the other object, that which gives it its name of sacerdotal. As such, the first charge on it is evidently the support of our Director in Paris, and in the last circular he has fixed definitively his requirements, understanding of course what is necessary to be understood, under the present conditions of our cause—at 6000 fr. (£240). This sum is in excess of what remains after the necessary expenses have been met. The English contributions are very much what they were last year, and it is not likely that the increase in France, both as to number of subscribers and amount of subscriptions, which you will have noticed the last year or two—an increase compared with the very low state to which they had fallen—will have given us what we want even for the demand above stated. And our real wants are far beyond that. We could usefully employ, even at present, a very much larger sum. I state this as wishing to set our position in its true light. But here, least of all, should I wish to put any pressure on any one. Speaking generally, I have every reason to think that our obligations in this respect are met in the best spirit, at times even more than met. The responsibility of deciding what amount of effort we should make rests entirely with each of us. If any one feels disposed and able to make further exertions, there is full room and justification for his doing so. One little point of detail I may add. It is comparatively unimportant when the payment is made, so that it be made before the 21st December, but it is good for each of us, and in conformity with the habits we inculcate, if it is made with regularity at the time chosen.

Our direct action, as a body with some degree of organisation, has been continuous during the two years. There has been no intermission in the meetings on Wednesday of the Positivist Society. There has been only the inevitable

amount of intermission in the Sunday Lectures, inevitable, due regard being had to our numbers, avocations, and health; due regard also being had to a particular pressure upon us just at this present time. As we cannot avoid breaks in our efforts, we should aim at introducing as much regularity into those breaks as is attainable.

We have, I think, without undue insistence or impatience, taken our part when any question of more than usual interest was under discussion, in whatever department it might be. I may instance the expression of our opinion on the question of Vivisection, on the punishment of the cabinet-makers, and the most recent of all, Dr. Bridges' utterance on the conduct of our Government and nation in regard to China, and incidentally Burmah. I confine myself to these as sufficient, well aware that there have been many other efforts in various directions, all converging to the good result of making it clear to those who take any interest in the movement that it is not one of mere intellect, but of most distinct and conscious social and religious action. It is important, whilst we mingle in the present antagonisms whenever the occasion is worthy, to remember that it would not be difficult to involve ourselves too deeply, that much which is of immediate interest is of immediate interest only, and must not be suffered to obscure our view of the more permanent.

This thought must have been brought home to many with great force of late, as a consequence of the most important point in our history during these two years—the publication of the first two volumes of the translation of Auguste Comte's principal work—*La Politique Positive*—to be followed at no very distant date by the two others. The thoughtful readers of that work, and such I have no doubt there are and will be—much more the translators—must have felt more than before probably the comparative unimportance of so much that is passing, the preponderance of the quieter and less-noted elements in human advance.

We have as yet no means of estimating what the effects of this translation will be. They will not come with observation, but none of us here doubt, I imagine, that however silently they come, they certainly will come; that excluding all personal considerations, all matters of detail, the final

achievement of this laborious task which has so long occupied much of our energy, and its production to the world, is a sound hope for the future of our cause, that it places it in a truer light before those who with leisure and sufficient intellectual training are bound to study it now that the obstacle of a foreign language has been removed, and you will agree with me in considering as so bound all who speak or write against the system which there finds its full exposition.

Whatever change this publication may work for us is a matter of the future. During the period under review our position has remained essentially the same as when I last spoke. The slight fluctuations of backward or forward movement—I am speaking of England—are not worth dwelling on. This very stationary character is of itself an evil, but in using this expression stationary, I apply it exclusively to our organisation properly so called. Outside of us I think there is much reason to believe that things are not so stationary. But as to ourselves I give the best judgment I can form, and leave it to your consideration. Whether I am right or wrong it is indisputable that our position internally acts very powerfully on our position as regards the outer world, as regards, that is, our influence. No amount of expressed contempt for our doctrines and our numerical or other insignificance, can conceal the fact that there is in many quarters a certain attention given to our body, that politically, socially, and religiously, and as the concentration of all these, educationally, many, and that of the better order of minds, feel a curiosity, a curiosity of no unpractical kind, as to what we say or do, and our strength within ourselves tells largely on the degree of practical result to which this curiosity leads. We have strengthened, I speak as if the work were complete, our outworks by the issuing of the great theoretic treatise, it remains for us to strengthen the main body of the fortress by the patient and judicious exertion of all our energies.

There is one point of our internal action on which I dwell with pleasure as connected with the quiet persistence of the movement amidst all difficulties. The acceptance of the Sacraments has continued as occasion has offered, the particular Sacraments accepted having been the first and

second, Presentation, and Initiation as the proper sequel to Presentation. The number is comparatively unimportant. What is valuable is the evidence of religious conviction such acceptance affords, and the promise it holds out for the future career of those who are unconsciously or consciously recipients, a promise we hope seldom to be falsified. Those who, as infants and as adolescents are entered in the service of Humanity, will, we may reasonably hope, unless the environment prove too unfavourable, remain throughout life in that service. It is for all of us who are of mature age to labour that the pressure be duly tempered to their strength.

Outside of our own immediate circle there is no change to be recorded so far as concerns Great Britain in the largest sense. In Ireland things are as they were. In India we have still one Oriental in communion with us, and the fact is a pleasant one. It will be long, however, before we repair the loss sustained in Dwarka Nath Mitter. From America I have long been without any Positivist news. I cannot say whether there is growth or decline there. The dropping of intercourse is not an encouraging sign. In France I believe the movement continues to spread slowly. There are, it is satisfactory to think, at least four centres of Positivist action, three, that is, in direct communication with Paris—Marseilles, Havre, and Bordeaux. Naturally it is in Paris that the rate of progress is quickest. But it is a great encouragement to find other groups forming under young and energetic leaders at a distance from the direct influence of the Parisian centre, stimulated by it, and a stimulus to it. Apart from France, we have no grounds for thinking that in any other European country, with the single exception of Sweden, where this year has brought us one adhesion, there exist any convinced disciples of the Religion of Humanity. There is good reason to suppose that the knowledge of our doctrines and the aims of our religious system is on the increase, but there is much to prevent such knowledge from translating itself into definite results as regards life and organisation. I should add that in France the other school, which is grouped around M. Littré, is not inactive, and, as I see from the papers, draws attention to itself. There is good in this, if largely mixed with evil.

I do not know that I am much given to be sanguine, or to overrate the actual progress we have made, apart from my confidence in the future, which remains as ever; and if I had any such disposition, I might, I think, count on the kindness of friends to check it. In fact, the last estimate I gave was considered by some too gloomy, an excess which I should wish to avoid. Whilst there is much that is discouraging in reference to ourselves, and without taking account of external hindrances, it is well to remember that we are quite at the beginning of things, that our religion, and it is solely as concerns the religion that there can be any question of discouragement, is not yet a generation old, scarcely two-thirds of a generation, dating it from 1855, or the year 67 since the opening of the great revolutionary crisis. Putting our existence at eighteen or twenty years, twenty for France, eighteen for England, and forming the most sober judgment, it can hardly be doubted that the advance has been considerable. Weigh well all the difficulties which it contains in itself, most especially the cardinal difficulty of its not moving, as previous religious changes have all done, in some measure on the same lines in regard to its great primary conception as its predecessors, and after weighing them, consider its spread and recognition in themselves, or compare them with the history of those predecessors during the same extent of time in their earliest stage, and you will allow that neither on the one nor the other ground is the comparison disheartening. We need not enter into the causes or the agencies at work in its favour, much less into any of the disasters which have befallen it, we may simply compare the position our religion occupied twenty years since with that which it now occupies, in the most general way, and we shall feel justified in arriving at the conclusion I have indicated. It may suit the Primate to assume a tone of confidence in the prospects of his Church, and to speak with unusual arrogance of the efforts of the philosophers, among whom I presume he would class us if it chanced that we were within his ken, but eyes less subject to the blinding influences of a position such as his, nay even some of those who stand nearest the archiepiscopal throne, by no means take the same view of the actual condition of belief, or the dangers to which it is exposed from the counter-

action of those who, including ourselves, hold either its negation or its substitute.

I venture on no prophecy as to our immediate future. I am more concerned with the impediments in the way of our advance: the impediments from without, I mean. Perhaps the greatest lies in the absorption of men, here and everywhere else, in questions—urgent, difficult questions—of immediate practical interest. The disturbed political state of Europe acts fatally as a bar to that quiet examination which its social and religious difficulties so imperatively demand. It seems as if any treatment of them must be adjourned to a time when, comparatively, peace shall be the general condition, and such a time appears to be distant, on the ordinary calculations of the observer. Whether distant or no, it is certain that a sense of coming troubles is now general, and of troubles the extent of which, as affecting a greater or less number of the European States, it is extremely difficult to measure, the attainable data being so unsatisfactory. It is no wonder if, in the anxiety engendered by such a state, men turn from the less exciting, if deeper, interests of mankind, or rather if they so lose themselves in the more superficial as hardly to be aware that the others exist. And yet this language requires great qualification. For the prominence of religious discussions, as connected more particularly with the action of the Roman Catholic Church, whatever we may think as to the area within which such discussions gain attention, is conclusive evidence that no degree of political commotion can wholly set aside the more permanent subjects which affect so powerfully the destinies of Humanity.

If we in England, from our peculiar position, have less reason than others to misjudge the relative importance of subjects, we are not wholly unexposed to the danger. For the external relations of our country have much of grave interest in them; more serious complications seem at hand than have been expected of late years, and as citizens we cannot abstract ourselves from them—our doctrine forbids us to do so. It has always led us to give great prominence to all such external questions, as it is in the widest relations of the different divisions of mankind that its influence should primarily make itself felt, and our own nation is more intri-

cately involved in those relations than any other Western State, by virtue of its commerce and its dependencies. The difficulties arising from this source are so numerous that it requires an effort to examine them with due attention, and yet keep ourselves from being over-occupied by them.

In reference to the political interests of our own country, which are at present in the foreground of discussion, we need feel no such embarrassment. They have no very powerful attraction for us. The colonial theory, for instance, of Mr. Forster, to which so much praise has been given—merging into an Anglo-Saxon, nay possibly a Teuton theory—seems, after all, instinct with the spirit of a narrow nationalism to those who have in any degree realized the larger conceptions of our religion. Bind her colonies to England so as to form some great imperial league of English nations, and the result may be conceivably good, but it may be also, and looking at the inherent tendencies of mankind it is more likely to be, fraught with evil to all outside it and to those within it, raising one more barrier in the way of the complete union of mankind. The natural ties which connect those who speak the same language, and have closer associations as sprung from the same country, may be fairly allowed for and encouraged without giving them any character of exclusiveness as regards others, and whilst discouraging their latent power for oppression. What with the pretensions of this race and the other, we are in danger of a renewal of the scenes of destruction which followed on the break-up of the Roman Empire, an utter confusion of the long-standing landmarks.

And even were there no such evil lurking in the proposal, it is calculated to dwarf the action of this country and to divert it from a larger policy, still to fix the eyes of Englishmen on England by itself—an enlarged England it is true—in the contemplation of its own isolated grandeur, not to draw us from our unhappy tendency to isolation and raise us to the level of our full human duties.

It is under the influence of similar considerations that we judge another event which has lately
action of our Government in the m
What the results of that action wil

inquire. A certain satisfaction that we have the nerve to act at all is perhaps an allowable feeling. But when that has been admitted, and when we turn to the policy which it is assumed to indicate, and the spirit which welcomes so jubilantly that policy, turn, in short, to the whole aggregate of questions which the special act suggests, there is no room for any feeling but regretful acceptance of the evil destiny to which our past and present conduct in the East is surely leading us. We have but bound more firmly on our shoulders the burden and the degradation of our Indian empire—removed further from us the possibility of atonement for our Eastern misdeeds by a just and wise policy of renunciation; of atonement for our shortcomings in the West by a re-entrance into full European citizenship. I know the studied moderation of language in which the transaction is defended, the reiteration that we want nothing but what is just and for the common good; that we are wholly intent on peace and good fellowship. So it is in the West; but contrast such a tone with our acts in the East, with the bearing we assume to any independent Eastern States, to **Burmah** or **China**, and the true value of our professions here appears in all its repulsiveness. The common language, such as our press thrusts it upon us, is truer and less irritating; our own immediate interests, we are told, are the sole norm of our conduct. All claims of others are unscrupulously to be set aside. And whilst this is the prevalent sentiment, all who would urge a different morality can but view the conduct to which such sentiment leads with disapprobation, patiently working towards a change.

The internal movements of the day—the home questions—are not of much stronger interest to us. There is nothing in them to draw us aside from the greater issues. Here again, as citizens, we may have to take a certain part, but it is only a certain part, for reasons varying with the varying questions. Take the suffrage for example; we who hold the whole elective theory radically unsound, can take but the coldest interest in all manipulations of it. They may be necessary—such are our traditions—but they can hardly be either of fundamental importance or of stimulating promise. The problems of labour and capital, on the other hand,

waken the keenest feelings, but as we hold that no solution but a moral one is admissible, we examine all others solely to see what amount of palliation they present, and exert ourselves to modify opinion in what we conceive is the only sound direction. Again, in the actual chaos of educational difficulties we have no inducement to mix, further than to try and shape opinion, so that it turn from the insufficient ideas and dangerous institutions in which those ideas are being embodied, to that which we consider a more rational conception and a freer and less compromising action. Lastly, on the question of disestablishment, we who are for spiritual freedom in the highest degree can have no hesitation in forwarding that movement, but it is not one in which our whole energies need be condensed; it will be when successful a negative result of unquestionable value, but it remains a negative result—a disencumbrance not a construction.

What I have been saying comes to this, that we are not a political party, and that not being such, direct political action is not our object, and the questions with which it deals are naturally of secondary importance in our eyes. This line would be imposed upon us by facts, if it were not adopted on principle, daily experience showing us how alien are our conceptions to those which prevail around us, how unacceptable the changes we advocate are to the great majority of our contemporaries. We are limited then to influence on opinion; our aim must be to form that which modifies all political action; our comfort that the rapidity with which it modifies is ever on the increase.

In this estimate of our political attitude I speak of course for the present. If our religious system has the advantage in consistency and comprehensiveness which we think ourselves warranted in claiming for it, then, as force gathers around the strong, we, whatever our individual and collective weakness, tend to become a centre of social ossification by its simple possession; and as opinion flows more in our favour, the natural result will be that it will give us (I abstract the question of time) the opportunity of directly wielding the forces we have created; the government will come to those who have best understood its true nature and purposes. We shall become political. In the meantime, it

is our wisdom to subordinate all our interference in the immediate events of the day, at any rate on all ordinary occasions, to our more appropriate functions.

If not a political party, what are we? A religious body, is the answer. A body bound together in some degree, though not in a very perfect degree, by the one common object of spreading a new religion in all its completeness; embodied, therefore, in a church organisation susceptible of universal application. It is a pleasure to think that, with difficulties increasing rather than diminishing, amidst much discouragement, the conviction that this is our true rational position has been, and is, gaining ground with us, infusing itself into all our thought and expression, destined therefore to permeate more thoroughly all our feelings and action. As it has been the absence of this conviction, or, at any rate, its weakness which has hampered us hitherto, we may reasonably hope much from its adoption or its growth. And primarily we may more than hope that when it prevails it will lead to correctness in our estimate of the relative importance of the numerous questions that present themselves as urgent, to the avoidance of one crying evil,—the waste, viz., of power in the attempt to remove evils, which to minds penetrated with the necessity of a religious change must wait for such change to bring any effectual remedy.

If I put the common question: what need have we for a new religion, and that rather in the sense of those whose inner thought it is that we need no religion at all, but not to the exclusion of those who, deeply satisfied with the existing, deny the want of any new faith, it is not so much to give it a direct formal answer as to introduce certain considerations bearing on the reasonableness of a new Catholicism in substitution for the old—of that which I last year spoke of as Human, in contradistinction to Roman, Catholicism.

The question, we should remember, has been asked before. The cultivated intelligence of the Græco-Roman world, inseparable on this point, the philosophers, the statesmen, the emperors of Rome, were brought face to face with it. And there was the same difference in regard to it then as I have just now indicated as existing at present. The results already attained in intellect and action were satisfactory to them so

far as that no change in principle was needed, no breach in the established order, no essential modification of the received thought. The fabric of empire which it had cost so much to raise, was in their conceptions permanent—the seat of civilisation and good government internally, externally a model and an influence which should gradually bring the habitable globe into harmony with itself. Such religious belief as existed had its value as an accommodation to the weakness of men, but to kindle it into greater activity, or to disturb it by the introduction of a new form, was prejudicial to the true welfare of society. It is some such judgment as this which underlies the strong condemnation of Christianity by Tacitus, and which explains the hostility of the Roman government to its professors. It is the same feeling which accounts for that which appears so strange to many, the apotheosis of the emperor as emperor, and irrespective of his personal merits. It was not as the unworthy ruler that he was worshipped in life or after death, but as the representative of the imperial order, which, whatever its faults, was felt to be the source of countless benefits, and which, as such, never lost the love of the nations it embraced. The answer then given to the question by the Græco-Roman society and the official world was a negative one, and was so not merely at the beginning of things, but down to a very late period of their existence; we might almost say that this negative answer ceased only with that existence, so audible is it amid the crash of the barbarian invasion.

And yet the scarcely perceived convergence of many currents of thought under many diverse influences, whether intellectual or practical, had been long silently working in the opposite direction, bringing each its contribution to the positive answer, to the construction of a new religion, and, as a consequence, the disappearance of the old. The solvent processes of scepticism, the wants of scientific thought, moral dissatisfaction with the traditional beliefs, influences derived from more monotheistic systems in the remoter East, the stimulus of national feelings—such are some of the principal factors in the final result—the creation of the peculiar monotheism which we call Catholicism or more properly Roman Catholicism. He to whom we owe it and its

successful establishment inherited all these convergent efforts, and fused them into one dominant conception, that of a great spiritual organisation, analogous to and standing side by side with the imposing temporal organisation of which he was a citizen, one indivisible church in presence of one indivisible empire, but the church capable of an extension to which the empire could not aspire.

I have omitted two impulses. The first is the philosophical, which was met by the great co-ordination of Aristotle and the establishment of an unity under which all human conceptions might find their proper place. On this I cannot enter; it would be too long for my limits, which, as it is, I shall rather exceed. This mention of it was necessary, but it must suffice. The second is enough for the present, and suits the occasion better. It is the paramount social impulse, the real source of the other's power, unrecognised it may be, but not the less dominant. The mass of empire, *moles imperii*, was bound together, and indisputably with great strength, by material and temporal ties; it was a political, administrative, governmental unity, but it had not a spiritual unity. The various religions existed side by side, but a common religion was wanting. There was, perhaps, some dim reference to this want in what I have before mentioned—the worship of the emperor—which invested with something of a spiritual colouring the order which found its condensed expression in him. But this remedy was insufficient and the evil must be met differently, by the propagation throughout the whole Roman world of a new spiritual order, satisfying for the time the deeper wants of mankind, appealing to the higher feelings of our nature and disciplining them. But we cannot wonder that the resistance to this new order was great. It was the new wine in old bottles. The instinct of the political governors taught them this, and they struggled hard to avert the disruption which was the inevitable result.

They did not see, probably at the outset neither side saw, what was clear to Dante, and is still clearer in the light of a fuller historical experience, that the political construction which ordinarily bears the name of the Roman empire was but the step towards the necessary preparation for Rome's second and wider and more enduring empire—that the throne

of the Cæsars must merge in the throne of the Popes. Only under the peculiar conditions of the papal supremacy could the true temporal order be inaugurated, and the compression necessarily attendant on the provisional system of Roman unity disappear before the freer life evolved by the interaction of numerous coexistent yet independent states.

Such was the advent of Roman Catholicism, such the ground of its success. As students of the Past we see, all see, that one of the two empires has disappeared in outer form, if, as may truly be said, it exists in substance in its legitimate heir, the republic of Western Europe, dated from the last true Roman emperor, Charlemagne. For that republic, I may say in passing, is instinct with the spirit of Rome, the Rome of the West, built upon her lines, shaped by her policy, tending, in despite of all transient appearances to the contrary, to return more and more upon Rome as her origin, the rock from which she was hewn. No vogue of a theory—which at present seems in the ascendant, vitiating and degrading all our historical conceptions—should blind us to its inherent weakness, intellectually as morally. The prevalent Teutonic theory to which I allude is to be rejected as incomplete and ungrateful. Such, I am confident, will be the ultimate judgment.

But to return. The second of the two empires, as all see, has not disappeared. Most, perhaps, are not without a latent conviction that it is not fated to disappear while the world lasts. In friend and foe alike this feeling of the permanence of Roman Catholicism is traceable, and the sources of the feeling might be traced and its existence explained were that my present object. To us here, I presume, it is evident that the same fate awaits the second as the first Rome—that the Roman Catholic Church, as the Roman empire, will issue in a new form of organisation to which in principle all that I have said of the temporal successor of Rome will be applicable, nay, is even now applicable. If, that is, we are wisely bold, if we, as our predecessors, Jewish and Christian, gain strength in our present weakness by a permissible abstraction of time in one direction, by a fair exercise of idealisation in the other. We need not shrink from the language of Isaiah. It shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of

the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. We may in spirit, if we modify the form, say with the Epistle to the Hebrews, that we are come to Mount Sion and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the First-born which are written in heaven, and to the spirits of just men made perfect. Rightly considered, such expressions become more real to us than they have ever been to those who lived under a less perfect dispensation.

Both the historical organisations, Empire and Church, stand on the same level. They are both anticipations and not more. They differ in the respect already noticed—the formal disappearance of the one, the continuance of the other. It might seem even here too audacious to add, what I really feel to be true, its formal continuance. They differ too in that the successor of the one is sufficiently admitted by all who attend to the subject, the West being no longer a term requiring explanation or apology, having taken its place in ordinary political writing. Even its functions are not without some faint recognition, too often, it must be allowed, with an oppressive end in view. Whereas the successor of the other, if we do not suffer ourselves to be misled by the vaguest, most unreal acceptance of a term, and if we do not insist unduly on certain tendencies, which are not however without value, is as yet not admitted, much less is its function recognised. It is still only to the few the centre of their being, the object of their faith and worship.

The function of the Roman Empire, as conceived by perhaps its purest emperor, the elder Antoninus, was to guide, as an elder brother, the other portions of the great human family. I know not that any expression can better render the true function of the Western Republic whenever its constituents shall awake out of their present troubled and ignoble dreams of self-interest and exclusive nationalism, and rise to the height of the responsibilities the past has laid upon them. Peace within itself, and concert as the sequel of peace, the cessation of all violent and repulsive action as regards all

without, such are the conditions for the healthy discharge of its function by the West,—conditions so difficult of attainment, and in appearance so distant, that to the wise and not unkindly scepticism which we have had lately enforced as the true political wisdom by one of the many official men, who in this time are, partly by inclination, partly by compulsion, more of the preacher than the statesman, they seem not difficult but impossible. We here are inexcusable if, with a wider range of historical judgment, and with a more reasoned conviction of the uninterrupted if imperceptible advance of great changes, with a firmer hold on sociological conclusions, we let ourselves adopt any such tone. So far as we can judge, it has no power to give strength, however much it may satisfy the common dread of being thought open to illusion. All allowance made for the slow march of human progress, our faith in the inferences drawn from the careful observation of the past, and supported by the true theory of man's moral constitution and physical environment, need not pale into scepticism however wise, however kindly—only in convictions can there be strength.

So far for the temporal considerations to which the question with which I began has given rise. The most important point to retain is, that simultaneously with a new order, for such was the imperial concentration, in one direction, there was required a new order in the other direction. The two changes in some degree coincided, and yet, when viewed in all their completeness, the one was the successor of the other, directing it to different issues and moulding it into a new shape.

I have to show reasons for thinking that the spiritual organisation, the second historical existence, the Roman Catholic Church, is also but an anticipation—or to speak as modestly as may be thought desirable, may be but an anticipation of the more powerful Church of Humanity, into which we wish to expand it as fulfilling it. And our ground for coming to this conclusion is, that it is inadequate to the task of dealing with the actual state of the world which *has* taken the place of that for the direction of which it *was* called into being, and within certain limits proved its competence.

We are wont to speak of the Roman Catholic Church as the church of the Middle Ages; and if we use this language with consciousness of its full meaning, we intend to limit the action of that church, its proper action, to that period, and to imply that since then it has ceased to answer its purpose as a church. Its members, doubtless, do not accept this inference, but even they would allow that in its medieval period it saw its best day, that it stood to the Europe of that time in a different and more satisfactory relation than it does to existing Europe. It was then the directing power in civilisation, whilst it can now but condemn and protest. This its present attitude may be looked on as temporary—its power for direction as simply in abeyance. To its convinced members, this is probably the view that commends itself. Those outside its pale, who share with it the fundamental beliefs on which it rests, yet think that it is a hindrance rather than an instrument in the way of those beliefs; those who are Christians, but not Roman Catholics, take the same view as we do when they turn from Latin Christianity as effete, and concentrate their attention on Teutonic Christianity, on the multiform belief, which, with more or less inter-connection, is summed up in the term Protestantism. I am not concerned with this point further. I have merely mentioned it as confirmatory of the judgment above expressed.

Protestantism is in the unhappy position of not being able to stand if Catholicism fall, and being doomed to fall if Catholicism can succeed in maintaining itself; it will be absorbed by the victor if it do not share the common ruin.

The function of the Roman Catholic Church was to be the connecting power of the numerous aggregate of independent states, uniting them by a spiritual tie, whilst they stood apart in government. It connected and directed them. It claims the same position now—why do we disallow its claim and disbelieve in the possibility of its successful assertion? I do not wish even to give the full answer. My object is to give one part of the answer, and with as little of a negative character attaching to it as possible.

One distinction which marks our actual state as contrasted with the Middle Ages, is the enlargement of the world, the greater complexity of human relations, by the contact which

has been established between all the parts of the habitable globe, now fully known to us, whereas it was then either unknown, or its known parts not in habitual communication. We have perhaps not hitherto been accustomed to connect this change with the great religious problem of mankind, but it bears upon it most certainly, and it is more and more seen to do so. One object with Columbus, the name most associated with this change, was to acquire the means for a crusade which should recover Jerusalem, and by its recovery, strengthen the Church to which his noble nature gave a hearty allegiance. The remote but direct consequences of his success, and of the movement which he inaugurated, are in the highest degree unfavourable to the creed, and consequently to the existence, of that church. Its inability to deal with civilisations which were entirely outside the range of its experience, might have been suspected from its failure before Mohammedanism; but it was painfully demonstrated in the collision with the Mexicans and Peruvians. It had a power for violent destruction—no power of understanding, modifying, and gradually raising a lower belief into a higher. In the cases mentioned the destruction was complete, and the Roman Catholic Church could plant itself upon the ruins it had made, and seek, to its honour be it said, to mitigate the evils with which it had been closely associated, so that the result was an extension of its area and a nearer approach to universality. We need not stop to inquire whether therein lay any sufficient compensation for the misery which had accompanied the process, or for the loss to Humanity in the broadest sense, of two of its outlying organs with the teachings their experience might have given us. We are more concerned with another point. What would be the issue when, in the course of the same great movement of discovery, the religious organisation of the West was confronted with civilisations which, from their tenacity, duration, and the numbers of their respective adherents, it would be hopeless to break or destroy, so that the only resource left was, in one form or other, persuasion.

For this is the new state of the world, which seems to require a new power to deal with it. No longer a great empire with some superficial unity, but the surface of the

planet with peoples at every stage of advance ; with religious beliefs of the most varying kinds ; with relations ill adjusted, though nearly four centuries have elapsed since the work of adjustment was begun ; with no atmosphere of quiet, no *pax Romana* favouring inter-communication ; rather with an atmosphere of latent, ill-concealed, and growing hostility ; the most civilised portion at discord with itself, but inclined to a certain degree of combination to make the most of the less civilised ; no prospect even to the wildest dreamer of compressing these divergent unities into one whole by any process of conquest, the only issue really open being that of comprehending them in one spiritual whole. We may well doubt whether even the most sanguine Roman Catholic considers the task as within the compass of his Church's power. It failed when the difficulties were comparatively trifling, why should it succeed when they are so increased and multiplied ?

Nor has that Church merely its past failure against it. It stands prominent among the causes which separate the nations at present. It is intimately bound up in the eyes of the Eastern empires with the humiliation inflicted on them by European military superiority. It must bear the consequences of such association. Its medieval tradition prolonged into more modern times established its irreconcilable hostility to Mohammedanism ; it has, since that hostility issued in pacific exclusiveness, widened the sphere of the enmities to which it is exposed by the aggressive spirit which it has displayed on more favourable fields. Again I remind you that I consider all forms of Christian belief as inseparable in principle from Roman Catholicism.

All seems to indicate that, adapted as it was, and in many respects admirably adapted, to a simpler and narrower sphere, it loses its applicability when it is brought into a state of wider and more complex relations. The presumption is against it, and strongly in favour of the opportuneness of some great religious change, the introduction of some new form which shall hold to the modern world the place held by the Roman Catholic Church to the medieval world.

Within the bosom of the Romish Church there have not been wanting signs of a consciousness of failure in the power

of adaptation, and a consequent longing for some changes which might revive that power. I am not alluding so much to such manifestations as that of the Calabrian abbot Joachim, with his presentiment of a coming reign of the Spirit superseding that of the Father and the Son, remarkable as the idea was when taken in connection with the time and direction of thought in the century which followed, and far from devoid of interest to us who wish to bring out all the links that form the 'increasing purpose of the ages.' It is rather to an episode in the missionary history of Roman Catholicism that I recur, the action of the Jesuits in India and China. It is well known that they were moved by their sense of the difficulties of their doctrinal system, when they had to present it to the disciples of other highly-organised religions, to accommodate it to the mental state of their auditors. They went far in theory and in act, and attained considerable results, but scarcely on behalf of the Christianity of the Western world. I have no wish to impugn the correctness of their judgment on the fact. But neither can I impugn the correctness of the papal decision which condemned them when the matter was referred to the Pope by the rival order, the order of the great paladin of Christ, St. Dominic. Two Christianities, an Eastern and a Western, had already tried sufficiently the faith of believers. Two forms of Roman Catholicism, an Eastern and a Western, must have been a fatal blow to the one and indivisible Church, which is bound to her *semper eadem* by all the weight of her history and her doctrine. We know the beauty of both. We know the grandeur of the conception of the mystical body of Christ, the church built on the foundation of the prophets and apostles, with Christ as the chief corner-stone, cemented by the blood of martyrs. We know how it fascinates many who as yet cannot accept it, with what devotion it has been, and is, served by many of those who believe in it. Nay, we know more than this. We recognise the unspeakable value to us of the long existence of this idea, and of the familiarity with such a conception, however incomplete, for the training of the human mind for a complete one of the same general character. We have no reason, however, to expect, though the Jesuit effort shews that the expectation is not a pure

dream, that such a church could change its front, abandon its doctrinal in favour of its social tradition, put forth once more a high capacity for government, and aim rather at the union of mankind than the universal acceptance of its creed. The divided state of Christendom alone is sufficient to make such a transformation impossible, were other reasons wanting. The flexibility of Rome, so justly admired, is great, but it has fixed limits. We need not wonder that she once again reviews and accepts those limits, and girds herself up on the basis of her inherited faith for the intenser conflict which awaits her. But, so limited, she must pass away. Her *semper eadem* is her sentence of death.

The various polytheisms of the nations Rome conquered had offered no invincible obstacle to the conquest—the gods were admitted into the Roman Pantheon as the nations were incorporated into the Roman State. But the admission recognised their existence, and high religious unity was unattainable with such multiplicity. Recourse was had to the one strictly monotheistic religion within the area of the civilised world, and the national God of the Jews, whose claims to sole existence had been gradually forcing themselves on that nation, became the one supreme God of the West, requiring an absolute rejection of all others. Thus was attained that unity which a number of almost co-equal religions could not give, as no one of them could reduce the rest to sufficient submission. Yet the process contained within itself the seeds of danger. In concession to the larger humanity which had slowly been evolved in the Western world it was necessary to modify greatly the character of the Jewish God. The Jehovah of the Old is very different from the loving Father of the New Testament. But it was necessary to go farther, and to bring the one eternal and almighty God into more direct relation with man, and the whole scheme of Christianity was gradually formed. As it advanced, Polytheism, scarcely alien to the conception of the Christ, rose again from its defeat and intruded itself successfully into the region from which it had seemed to be expelled. The Western monotheism under these circumstances presented itself as a failure to the keen glance of Mohammed, the more so as he was brought more into contact with its doctrinal orthodoxy and

poverty of life, and not with its better side and its powerful action on society. He fell back on the Jewish traditions, and in the name of the unity of God, the absolute incommunicable unity, shattered the aspirations of monotheism to constitute the unity of man, even within the limits above given, the area of the so-called civilised or Greco-Roman world. The problem had been simplified in reference to the Polytheistic era; but it had not been solved. It indicated still in this simplified form the want of some unity which could absorb all the contending powers, no one of them being gifted with the amount of vitality required for the assimilation of its rivals. Either we must renounce the religious unity of man, and acquiesce in all the consequences of such renunciation, a state of persistent strife and waste, or we must look elsewhere for that which the existing faiths have not as yet given us, and show no signs of being able to give us. I will not spend your time in discussing the question whether aught else but religion can really bind the different branches of mankind into a durable union. No religious man can hesitate on such a subject, and it is to the religious-minded that I here address myself.

All the existing faiths have one or more common notes which exclude them from the chance of success in their effort after universality. They are all local—bound up, that is, in their origin and history with certain local peculiarities and associations not to be shared in by the others—they each rest upon a certain aggregate of conceptions, which has been the slow growth of ages and which is different from that of all the others. Compare the complex tradition on which Christendom is based with the far simpler one of Islam, or both with the foundations of the Brahminical or Buddhist religions. Further, they are all—it is almost a consequence—exclusive and condemnatory of one another, and, as a rule, recognizing but faintly any sympathy between their disciples and the rest of the human race. Condemned to be partial and separatist—condemned, I mean, by the force of circumstances, for propagation by conquest is no longer feasible, and by persuasion practically hopeless—they are, whatever their separate merits, as they exist at present, more adapted to foster hostile feelings between the nations than to bring

them into union. They are all in contradiction with their avowed object.

And yet union is the instinct, secret or proclaimed, of the world. In one form or another the cry for it is growing louder and louder. The more we dwell upon the actual disunion in thought, the more forcibly we state it in word, the more we realise that the time is ripe for the announcement of that which can alone put an end to it—a new religion. Anything short of this falls below the need. This is the conviction we here wish to spread, certain that once admitted it cannot fail to bear fruit in action. True, we have gone farther—we have for ourselves accepted a new religion, and on the ground that it satisfies all the conditions, so far as our judgment goes, of a religion, which may be briefly summed up in the one now insisted on: it is capable of comprehending and raising, and finally absorbing all others. But however complete, however well grounded our own acceptance, when we consider others, it is wiser to leave them to approach the subject in their own way; rather to induce them to examine whether some such change is not imperatively demanded than to urge them to acquiesce in the particular form we advocate; when they admit this necessity, they will be led on to examine that particular form, and then it may be we may find the fitting hour for assistance, for pressing in their full force its claims to be the one thing needed. This language of course refers only to our propagandist action, has no bearing on the direct proclaiming of our religious convictions as involved in our every-day life and conversation.

Let so much, however, be said about our religion. Whatever the precise form in which it may clothe itself in the immediate future, however the resistance of men may divert it from its legitimate course, stunt it so that it attain not its full proportions till such time as its inherent powers overbear opposition and give it its due supremacy—nay, even on the extreme supposition that, as we conceive it, it in no way secure acceptance, there yet will remain two points from which there will be no withdrawal, two positions which are an acquisition for ever. The name will remain. The Religion of Humanity, once so named, constitutes an ideal which will be the goal of unbroken effort for the future, the object of

aspiration for all generations, till in some measure it become a reality. And, secondly, the distinctive character of that religion as opposed to the theological Catholicism which it supersedes, the distinctive feature which makes it hopeful, will be preserved; it will be a human religion, with no reserve in favour of interests not connected with this earth, widely as we may extend the range of interests which are connected with it. It must by virtue of this name and this character know no exclusiveness or separatism, no condemnation of any portion of the past, no alienation from any of its predecessors, it must be able to understand and to deal with every form of man's thought and action; passing even beyond the strict sphere of man, and in rational relation with all his environment, organic or inorganic. So much, I think, we may consider as gained by the foundation of our Religion, and if men persist in reducing it to that, the constructive effort of Auguste Comte, by overcoming the principal difficulty, that of the first step, remains of incalculable importance. I take the most subdued tone to-day, not as myself feeling any more hesitation about our own victory than I have ever felt, but wishing to keep prominent throughout the presumptive arguments in favour of our general object rather than the assertion of the superiority of our particular method of attaining that object.

One remark, however, I shall permit myself in relation to our Founder, a remark suggested by all that I have said. Few expressions of his have given rise to so much irritation as the one in the preface to the Catechism, in which he speaks of his career as representing in succession that of Aristotle and of St. Paul. I am here only concerned with its truth and its explanation. I stop not for any other consideration. The judgments of the truly great upon themselves are justified by the future. But to understand this particular judgment and see that it is true—this, I think, is easy. We have seen that the religious change from Polytheism to Monotheism (Christianity and Islam are but complementary parts of one whole, and the intermediate term Greek or Byzantine may be suppressed), was composed of two movements, the one philosophical, represented by Aristotle, the other religious, represented by St. Paul, and that the last was possible by virtue of the first. So the final

religious change from theistic religion in all its forms to a human religion, the greatest of all changes, must be composed of two movements, the one philosophical and the other religious, the former making possible the latter, the former overcoming the intellectual difficulty, the latter the social and moral difficulty. As an intellectual question it was necessary to remove the barrier which had been provisionally raised between the two great provinces of human thought, to do away with the distinction between reason and faith that had previously existed, and to bring all man's reasonings under one and the same method, to claim for science its just, its full limits, so making it possible to mould the various sciences into one philosophical unity, and to fuse science into faith. I pass the more lightly over this point as we have had the principle on which the operation was conducted, viz., the successful application of the subjective method, explained lately in this room by Dr. Bridges. I am warranted in using the term successful by the degree in which it has already gained the adhesion of thinkers. This is the first, the philosophical movement, the creation of the Positive Philosophy—to which M. Comte always with justice applies the term fundamental. The second, the religious movement, is the foundation of the Religion of Humanity, which followed rapidly on the former and may here be asserted to be successful, even if limited, as the more hesitating would limit it, to the simple enunciation of the basic principle which has to wait for a long process of evolution to develop its consequences. I believe that much of the hesitation proceeds from an intellectual objection. It is seen that the earlier analogous change was much longer in the effecting, that its two movements were not merely conducted by distinct organs, but were in time much farther apart, lastly, that the second of the two was in origin not a full construction, but the proclamation of the seminal ideas which were to lead to the growth of a construction; and it is required that the same process should be repeated in the later change. There is an objection to accepting one organ for its two movements, as there is to their great proximity in point of time. I shall not attempt to do much more than point out where I conceive the answer to this objection to lie. It is the not allowing the proper

weight to the time that separates them—the difference of the circumstances under which the two changes take place—which is the defect. The very simple fact that one succeeds the other with an experience of many centuries between them, such experience embracing two separate portions, the one portion being the experience of the change when it was in the ascendant, recognised as the source of all political and ecclesiastical order, honoured by the reverence and love of those whom it affected—the second portion being the experience of the change when it was exposed to criticism and opposition, when it was in decay, and enquiry was rife as to how it was to be superseded, and by what—this simple fact might prepare us for expecting that the process would be different for the later change in everything but what was essential to it. Nor is it easy for any of us, even when most convinced of the truth of Positivism, to estimate aright the power given to a great thinker by such a mastery of social phenomena as was possessed by the creator of sociology. In a well-known passage, Mill says: ‘The power which may be acquired over the mind by the idea of the general interest of the human race, both as a source of emotion and a motive to conduct, many have perceived; but we know not if any one before M. Comte realised so fully as he has done all the majesty of which that idea is susceptible. It ascends into the unknown recesses of the past, embraces the manifold present, and descends into the indefinite and unforeseeable future.’ A source of emotion and a motive to conduct. True—but we may add, a light to the intellect, informing it and guiding it in all its processes till it issue in the highest of all, a synthetic construction. Nor again must we forget the strong social purpose, the religious fervour it might be called, which had prevailed in the immediate predecessors of Auguste Comte, which he inherited, and of which he witnessed the successive discouragements which have so weakened it in his successors. The aspirations and the failure were alike stimulating, and the accounting for the latter led to the discovery of wherein lay the satisfaction of the former.

Still there is some reason for the doubt, when we consider human powers, as to the feasibility of one man’s producing

both the philosophy and the religion which is its superstructure. And I think M. Comte recognised this, saw that he might have missed the last crowning success, and it is because he felt that in the love of Madame Clotilde de Vaux he found the stimulus which enabled him to attain it and by attaining it shorten the efforts and hasten the welfare of his race, that he uses the language he does in speaking of her influence.

All the sources open to M. Comte in the work of creation are accessible to us in our work of appropriating his creation—and more accessible because of his guidance. We may compare, as a body we are peculiarly fitted by our earlier education for the comparison, the Christian or monotheistic revolution with our own; the earliest steps in each we are familiar with. We have it in our power generally, it requires less and a different effort than is thought, to make ourselves acquainted, so that it may become an intimate part of our life, with the social history of our race, and when armed with this knowledge we may inspire ourselves with all the emotions it excites. Lastly, the pressure of the contrast between hope and fruition is as heavy now as it ever was; the heavier the longer the deferring continues. The impulse due to it should be the stronger in that we claim to know the remedy.

We do not shrink, and I believe we are right in not shrinking, from acknowledging, both to ourselves and others, the great difficulty of the task we have undertaken. It is well to face it—our real strength depends on our doing so. But we may overrate it, and the greater danger lies perhaps this way. It has been well shown of late that it is not so difficult as it might appear at first sight. The continuity which underlies the disruption has been powerfully set forth. To the religious mind the wrench is not so great as is thought. I use the term religious mind as contradistinguished from the mind steeped in theological doctrine—a state which in no way implies the other, as our experience tells us. Whenever the intercourse of life brings us into contact with men of the former stamp, men or women who believe to the fullest the special doctrines of the older faith without letting their belief degenerate into a barren and noxious orthodoxy, some mutual understanding, a large amount even of

sympathy is not an unfrequent result ; at least so I have found. There are degrees of charitable interpretation, but some degree is generally perceptible. And this is reasonable, for we have much in common ; our spirit is the same, if it work by different methods.

I have no liking for criticism, in the general sense in which this word is used, the critical literature which is at present popular. It seems a waste of time for the writer as for the reader, and for those who are exposed to it it is rarely of any use, least so perhaps when most favourable : but whether favourable or not, it has a tendency to weaken. Its effects in this way are palpable in every direction, enfeebling thought and taking all vigour from action. There is one criticism, however, which I allude to, as it bears upon what I have been saying as to the breach between us and the religious body from which we have come out. Recognizing the affinity between our moral conclusions and what is noblest in Christian morality, or in their own conception of it, for men are too much inclined to confuse the more recent acquisitions of morality with its earlier statements and import into these latter much which is due to subsequent advance, writers, as others, are apt to say, you are but a product of Christianity ; you say what it says, feel as it taught you to feel ; isolating them from their source, you are yet reproducing its lessons. I do not wish to examine the amount of truth this language contains, much less the validity of the inferences it implies. Experience will show those who use it, what a large amount of error is mingled with its truth. I quote it for its admission that there is some community between us and the more religious of our opponents, tending to diminish the sense of separation.

It is pleasant to think that it is so ; more pleasant as we advance in life, to think that our really great change in opinion is an intellectual rather than a moral or religious change, a growth necessitated by the imperious wants of our social state, not a negative rejection of burdensome obligations, a clothing upon rather than an unclothing, a fulfilment not a destruction. It is pleasant, as we retrace the years, to feel that we can see more good than we used to see ; can understand and make allowance for what evil we saw or see ; can

evoke sympathies where unhappily they were wanting; brighten associations which had become obscured; make pleasant memories which had a tinge of bitterness; can absolve wrongs—wrongs done by others to us, or harder still, wrongs done by ourselves to others—by understanding their source, which otherwise it were difficult to forgive. As we deepen in ourselves the sense of our common humanity, and by deepening it introduce unity where there had been discord, we enter into fuller possession of all that the past, our own as well as that of the race, has accumulated of precious material, having herein a great advantage over our monotheistic forefathers, Christian or Islamic. In no temple raised by human hands need we feel altogether strangers, certainly in none of the religions which have those temples as their outward symbols, least of all in the temples in which our earlier worship was paid. No form of society, no polity, but has its interest for us; no construction of the intellect, imaginative or scientific, no construction of the action of man, but with us can find its place and have its value allowed, although for our purposes, and under the limitation of our powers, we concentrate our attention on the more important.

When we are told that we want the means of grace, it is well to call to mind considerations such as the foregoing, and to dwell on the power of our religious system to use all that exists around us that is ennobling and beautiful. And the one is no intrusion, we do but use our own. This is apt to escape those who stand outside us, and look down upon the poverty of our present. They forget too much their own past; but they also do not appreciate our strength, the logical result of our whole conceptions. We, as they, enter into the labour of others, and whilst not failing in gratitude for what we receive from others, can allow no superior, no equal title to its possession, much less any claim to exclusive possession by the right of succession. Humanity inherits all the services of her children to whatever power they have nominally been rendered. But naturally the servants of other powers are slow to recognise the transfer of the results of such service; only we ask them to remember that whereinsoever they are truly rich, we are rich also, that we shall avail ourselves of their treasures, whilst as yet they are not absorbed into the

direct treasure of Humanity, with as full a sense of property as they can have.

If we have in any degree hitherto been timid in asserting this claim, we should be so no longer. In the interval which must exist before the substitution of the new faith is completely effected, the conviction of its comprehensiveness and of its ultimate destiny may be an ever-present encouragement, supplying our actual deficiencies. In a word, our means of grace are very much what we choose to make them with a system like ours, in no way limited by the pressure of others. The highest of all such means, the communion of faithful men bound together in the common promotion of a worthy cause, that, at any rate, it depends on ourselves to enjoy. For the more subsidiary means, and for all the ornaments of devotion, if we have to wait, it is but a necessity of our present circumstances, and can concern only our public devotion—the accumulations of the past relieving us of all sense of bareness or destitution in all the rest of our existence. There is no process of increasing a small number and remedying its evils but addition, a simple truth which is not always adequately recognised.

We dare not lower the greatness of our new creation. The words may sound familiar to some among us in another context. But they are true in our mouths. We can perhaps realise them more fully than others, as we can compare all the grandeur of our prospect and the humbleness of our actual state—or as we compare the extension of our claims with the degree of their recognition. The comparison makes it seem daring even to state them—yet we cannot veil them. We cannot conceal the fact that if we are anything we are the representatives of the only true Religion, the sole Catholic Church. Feeble as are our beginnings as the representatives of that religion, we must consider that all others stand to us somewhat in the relation of sects, only without the term raising in our minds any of the feelings of alienation it raises in either of the conflicting Christian hierarchies, the Roman and the Anglican. For all other bodies organised as religious have one characteristic of a sect, a partial appropriation of the universal doctrine. Partial as they all are, even the most averse to this designation, they are all recognised as useful.

We look on them as tributaries, and not as enemies, as preparatory without any rivalry. This position, I repeat, we must claim—but the claim can have no bad effect on us if we steadily contemplate its contrast with our present. The immediate effect must be to sober us, the danger is lest it unduly depress us. There are perhaps times with all of us when it tends that way, and there are probably some with whom it is always so, crushing their disposition to accept the new truth. We shall long suffer from this cause, enhanced in its influence by the weight of ridicule which hangs around the inevitable discrepancy between the promise and the attainments, as between the work and the instruments. It will need a strong faith to persist. Yet there is ample reason for persistence—none, rightly viewed, for ridicule, and I believe this to be the inward conviction of those who are most given to use ridicule as a weapon against us.

All combines to show that, in older words, it is in the fulness of time that the religion we preach has been proclaimed to the world, if we take as the measure of that fulness the wants of the race and the adaptation of our doctrines to the whole requirements of the case. That the resistance would be great—the progress slow—for this all the history of past movements of a similar character must have prepared us, no less than a study of the greater thoroughness of this particular movement. There is then nothing in what we see happening around us in regard to it, either beyond our expectations, or of a character to shake our faith in its ultimate triumph. Let patience have its perfect work—such is the lesson we must learn, as others before us have learnt, and have been strong by learning it.

We enter this day on the first year of the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the century which M. Comte places in parallelism with the fourth as exceptional. We shall not all see the close of these twenty-five years. Very many of us however probably will. What will be the record then? We must be prepared for either alternative. It may be that we may have to meet worse times than we have yet met—that we may see the break-up of our present organisation, the dispersion of its members, the love of many waxing cold, their faith failing them from impatience or other human

weaknesses, their aid denied us from yielding to some of the noblest, or being led astray by some of the most contemptible of our impulses, or it may be simply a time of slower progress, of less hope, the depressing tedium of a long halt. Whatever the particular form of the evil, I doubt not that some of us are resolved to hold on whether alone or in company, whether standing shoulder to shoulder with those who have hitherto been with us, or deprived of their support, or even exposed to their active hostility; that through honour and dishonour, through evil report and good report, some will continue faithful to the end, to the noble cause which they have made their own. No passing gloom will make them renounce their service, even though their dispersion and isolation may be such that to the common judgment anything that might be called a social organ of the new Religion may have ceased to exist. I do not think, looking at all the circumstances, that in this and the generation or two which will follow, such a course of our movement is impossible.

But whilst facing this darker alternative with all the confidence given by the conviction that the gloomy period is but a passing incident, and the interruption more apparent than real, it were wrong to put it forward as the more probable. I am speaking, be it remembered, of the Anglo-Saxon branch of the nascent church, and it is not unnatural that this should be the less hopeful as involved in greater difficulties than the French from our social, intellectual, and personal antecedents. But even thus limiting the subject, looking at the congregation which, whether present or absent I in spirit address, the congregation formed of all those who are united with us by speaking the same tongue, there is sufficient reason for the more cheerful alternative. Calling up before me the whole of the forces which are available, but which have never yet been fully put forth, and after weighing the obstacles we have encountered, and the influences at present working in our favour, taking into consideration the time that has elapsed, and the degree of advance which has been realised, I feel that there is ground for expecting a sustained progress, perhaps even one sensibly accelerated.

Whichever judgment be right, one thing is certain, that the demand upon us will be great, and that all possible

preparations should be made to meet it. Unfavourable though the aspect of all things be to us now, it is well to bear in mind the great rapidity of present changes, the suddenness with which a totally different aspect may be presented to us, conditions in which the power of our doctrine might find full scope, and from a thousand as yet hidden sources, force might accrue to those who represent it. We cannot tell. But we know that the whole social order of the past is undermined, resting on beliefs which have lost their hold, and are sustained mainly by the effort of the will, and from the dread of the unknown. I allow there is a rally—a decided rally—of the older faith, but there may be a rally of the energies before death, as there may be a rally which ashers in convalescence. We know also, that in days of trouble, such as these undeniably are, whilst many renew their worship at the altars of the elder powers, the stronger portion turns to seek new hopes, anxiously scrutinising the rising forces of the future, rather than leaning on the decaying, though familiar, influences of the past. These and similar thoughts should lead us to most patient and deliberate preparations which may be useful in any event, for slow growth as for some sudden dawn of greater issues. Saturating ourselves with all the doctrines of our religious system, and by their help studying with incessant attention the world in which we have to act and the means by which we can affect it, studying, therefore, the conditions of any religious movement, and naturally with deepest interest the conditions of our own special organisation, how it is to be made to attain its highest efficiency; training ourselves in our own lives to that which we may justly call our reasonable service, the consecration of ourselves to Humanity; training others, as with many it is a duty, to the same service, and, so far as we can, helping others, which with all is a duty, in some degree or other; by such thoughts and such actions kindling all our nobler emotions, so as to draw from them all the support they alone can give, placing us in living communion with all that there has been, all that there shall be, of true, and beautiful, and good, tempering our whole nature, and forming it to its highest state, enthusiasm in its true sense, which I define as a disciplined

character glowing with suppressed, it may be, but deep feeling—such is in outline the preparation we all need if we would meet the exigencies of the longer or shorter day which is left us for work. In such preparations would be the pledge of advance, for what we are in ourselves, that and no more we shall write upon the world.

I have, wherever it suited my purpose, used the language of the older faith, the expressions of the Jewish or Christian Testament. I have used them freely, and stated my grounds for so using them. And as I review the whole of this discourse, and bring into juxtaposition its various parts and what they suggest, placing side by side my estimate of our actual state, and the future of the cause—what we have done, or are doing, and what our duty binds it upon us to do—the training we have received and the training we have to give ourselves; our breach with the past and our affinities with the past; our own feebleness and the burden laid upon it; the necessity for being independent of older associations and teachings, yet the desirableness of keeping them fresh as the source of communion with those to whom they are still what they once were to us; or again, the monotheistic revolution of the earlier centuries of the received era with the human revolution inaugurated in this century; the intellectual and social preparation for the former with the corresponding preparation in our own case; the Roman Empire and the Republic of the West; the world in which the one was the leading social organism and the world which the other should guide and pacify; the Roman Catholic Church, its organisation and its methods, and the Church of Humanity, with its methods far in advance of its organisation; the older gospel with the new, for ‘surely we may call the Religion of Humanity “good news” with greater truth than that of Christ’ (as one wrote to me this morning); as all these contrasts rise before me, if fraught with great hopes for us, yet also fraught with great, almost overpowering responsibilities; you will not wonder if I once more take you back to the same source, and seek to gain strength from words drawn from the very inmost sanctuary, words of the most eminent of all the names which honour the earlier Catholicism, whom we adopt with most reverent love into the roll of the servants of its successor,

which therefore are spoken to us and for us, and which we can feel, if alive to our position, as inwardly as any have felt them—if I conclude in the language of St. Paul—that we ought to ‘approve ourselves in much patience, in necessities, in tumults, in labours, in watchings, by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, by honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report, as deceivers and yet true; as unknown and yet well known; as dying and behold we live; as chastened and not killed; as sorrowful yet alway rejoicing; as poor yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things.’

May the spirit which breathes in this passage be ours in this and all succeeding years.

SERMON DELIVERED AT THE

POSITIVIST SCHOOL, 19, Chapel Street, Bedford Row, W.C.,

on the Festival of Humanity 88 (1 January, 1876.)

HUMAN CATHOLICISM.

SERMON III.*

I have little to say on the condition and prospects of our movement. As the years pass swiftly by us, each brings but slight change, and it will be later, after some time, that their added results will become perceptible in the retrospect, and so a judgment on our course be rendered possible.

Meanwhile, it is for each and all of us to examine ourselves and see how far we are aiding our cause; how far we are acting on the religious principles we have adopted; how far they are able to detach us from, or leave us in, the old use and wont, the old habits, the old feelings, the old selfishness and narrowness. Or again, how far we are able to substitute them, with good results for ourselves and others, for what there was of good and noble in our earlier state. Are our hearts enlarged, our thoughts widened, our lives purified, our whole existence more social?

I must leave it also to my hearers to survey and judge our state as a body, the degree of union and concert which exists, and the proportionate effects it produces on the outside world and on its own members—the degree in which it offers the character of a church with power to attract, at a time when almost any union exercises a great power. If the judgment be satisfactory—well and good. If it be the contrary, it would be wise for them to sift the causes of the unsatisfactory condition they admit. I offer no remarks here on the subject.

Our ordinary action has been uninterrupted; our teaching, our meetings, the work of translation, occasional publications, all have continued. It has even been extended

* The commemorative form given pp. 225, 226, applies also to this third sermon.

by some lectures in the East of London. We have lost by death—we have gained some new and valued adhesions. Opinion outside us has been much as usual—in the main hostile, so far as it directly notices us—with or without consciousness advancing towards us, and making large concessions in favour of our conclusions, evidencing a constant process of modification, and, so far as it is reluctant, the more valuable, acceptance. On this point the continuity of advance is unquestionable. And were we content to look on—were we disciples of the expectant method in human affairs—we might register the progress and be satisfied, as many appear to be, who, without joining or wishing to join in our movement, have adopted the doctrine and its method, and desire that both may spread.

Their position has many advantages. Would it be well to accept it for ourselves? It is at any rate difficult to do so for any who watch closely what is going on in the world. Only under imperious necessity can those who acknowledge the existence of certain evils, and that they are not only to be remedied but that the remedy has been pointed out, fold their arms and remain spectators. If the sense of weakness or of failure be painful, not less so must be that of constrained inaction.

It may be as well to say that the third volume of the translation of the 'Politique Positive' has been published this year, and that the fourth volume is shortly to appear—in February, I think, but possibly a little later.

With regard to our cause in France, I will confine myself to one or two remarks.

There has been published in Paris a collection of three speeches made, or meant to have been made, had occasion served, by Positivist working men at the Workmen's Congress last autumn. The one which was spoken attracted notice in the English papers. Some may like to have them, and I have put a notice of where they may be got at the end of the room. It may also interest many to know, that on Sunday, December 24, M. Laffitte began a course of lectures on Sociology in a much larger room than that in which he usually lectures—a public room in the Rue du Bac 57, capable of seating 300 carers. There were 200 present, I am told, at the opening

lecture, and the audience was attentive and sympathetic. The programme of the course is given at the end of the little book above mentioned. He and others in conjunction with him have also during the year been active in lecturing, in various quarters of Paris, at the popular libraries lately established. If, however gradually, freedom of speech in public continues to grow in France, a greater attention may be secured for the Positivist conception, and that from those from whom it is at once most probable and most desirable. It is worth remarking that in Holland and in Sweden, countries to which their position gives peculiar importance, there is evidence of considerable attention being given to the doctrines of Positivism, and in the latter country we have a direct preaching of the Religion of Humanity.

Passing from the centre outwards, whilst at the extremities we still preserve our contact with the East, with the Brahminical population of India, we have gained a contact in one of the most remote, and I judge least organised, of the United States, in Texas, an adhesion which has an interest at once from its distance and complete isolation. These scattered adhesions have a value of their own, which makes me mention them, however few they may be who give them, for they witness in their loneliness to a strong faith, and the mention of them is peculiarly appropriate on this day, as they are the first betokenings of the looked-for convergence of the race.

I dwelt last year on the great hindrance thrown in our way by the absorption of men in the questions of immediate practical interest. The evil has not grown less in the year which has since past, nor does it seem in the way of growing less. For the most rational outlook is one of great trouble. It seems at first sight more than ever difficult to rise above the disturbance and anxiety of the political world, and to hold firmly to the religious side of our movement, considering all else as secondary. The effort, however, is assisted by certain features in the more prominent political questions under discussion. For instance, in regard to Eastern Europe, there is a large mixture of religious feeling in the discussion, be the disclaimers of any crusading dispositions as loud, and from many, as sincere as they may. Such intermingling

recalls us to more general considerations, and raises the whole matter out of the mere routine of competing ambitions by forcing on us the thought : How are the various faiths of the world to be harmonised or superseded ? So, again, in respect to the second great question, that of France. What do we see there but that which we know to be common to her with the other countries of the West, and only more urgent there than elsewhere—the continual recurrence, I mean, of the religious difficulty, of the relations of the present social state with the Catholicism of the past, that great controversy whose settlement is yet distant, and which, whilst unsettled, will rend every country within the limits of the Western world, if not beyond those limits ; for, unfortunately, the action of the Roman Catholic Church is not confined to them. Add to this, the religious aspect of the two cases, the further complications—in the one, of the antipathies of race, in the other, of the antagonism of classes—and it will be evident that no right appreciation of either can be limited to the more immediately practical, but must, with whatever effort, rise to a wider survey, which may offer us a hope of fusing all such opposition in a higher unity. And this is only attainable on the ground of religion, a conclusion which may render easier the exertion required.

The effort, if made, will be rewarded by greater calmness in our judgment of the present, without making us indifferent. We are not likely here to run into that error, as is seen by the general direction our action in this country has taken hitherto—a direction indicated by our circumstances. The comparative quiet we enjoy, the absence of any very urgent pressure in our political world at home ; these enable us to follow the guidance of our Master, and to give a continuous attention to the larger relations of Humanity, which under very troubled circumstances at home were perhaps beyond us. Our national position tends the same way, as it is ever giving prominence to those larger relations. We know as well as others, that under the superficial quiet in this country, there are here, as elsewhere, unsolved problems of the greatest importance, and we in nowise shrink from taking our part in the solution of those problems as they come to the surface. But the other class, the external problems, is daily forced

upon us from the very extended range of English contacts; and whilst at times we may regret the necessity of attending to them, we cannot decline it. There is ample justification, then, for the characteristic feature of Positivist action in England—the larger space it accords to international as compared to national questions, at any rate more immediately. All we have to do is to see that such prominence be strictly relative, be kept rigidly in its due place.

It is only in thus subordinating all the numerous minor questions to that of a religious renovation that we can find a safeguard from the common and dangerous error of a partial, one-sided, attention to this or that particular evil. The extreme preoccupation of our countrymen in the Eastern question is a case in point; for it is greatly to be feared that under cover of this one interest much may pass elsewhere unquestioned which should be closely watched. For instance, in our dealings with China, the seeds of grave complications may be or may have been sown unheeded whilst all eyes are turned in another direction—or, what is scarcely problematical, the violent perversion of all right government which has been revealed, not in a Turkish province, but in an English settlement, in Barbadoes, may escape unnoticed and unremedied in consequence of this undue absorption. In fact, in the mere number of difficulties there is an obstacle to any sound judgment. So completely are all the relations of states, to limit ourselves to them, out of joint, that each day may see a new series of questions suddenly arise, requiring action, without there having been any previous elaboration of the principles on which such action can be based. For this, as for the previous difficulty, the only remedy is to keep ourselves at the centre of things, to work hard at the formation and mastery and spread of the great principles which alone can be a satisfactory guidance; to attain so far as is possible that universal, in other words, that religious point of view which places each successive novelty in its due relation. From the same source we may derive protection from another common misfortune—the hasty decisions of impatience.

It is not my object to detail the various troubles under which the world is labouring, scarcely any larger constituent

of Humanity being without its own peculiar embarrassment either internal or external, in many cases both. The two cases I have already referred to are sufficient to illustrate the general disorganisation which is becoming more and more recognised. What I have spoken of as the Eastern question illustrates the discord between the beliefs of mankind, the old quarrel half-revived between Asia and Europe, between the Eastern and the Western world, and the latent hostility which may yet throw them one upon the other. The second, the question of French order, illustrates the internal disunion of that Western world itself, which so powerfully interferes with its wholesome action outside of itself. We all know that these are but examples, and that between the two there is at any rate all that is implied in the antagonism of the several States of the West, based on the supposed conflict of their respective interests, the result being a condition hardly other than permanent war. It is but fair to allow that efforts are being made to remedy this last evil at any rate; that there is a counter movement towards unity of action, an increased sense of its desirability—a wish resting half on reason, half on alarm, to avert the natural consequences of the prevalent distrust. And what is more consoling than any such avowed efforts is the underlying tendency of men's ordinary interests to place a barrier in the way of those natural consequences, for they are seen to threaten all peaceful existence, to interfere with industrialism. Allowing for both these counterventions, it yet remains true that the opposite state is the dominant one, and that, immediately, it is not easy to see how the evil with which it is pregnant can be averted. So completely, owing to the revolution which is still silently being worked out in the West, has European order been discomposed; so vain, from want of a due understanding of the disease to be treated, have been the remedies applied or imagined.

For is it possible, as we watch what is going on, to resist the conclusion, that the powers at present invoked are inadequate, that the older social forces are spent, whilst the new either act equivocally, as much that is for disorder as for order, or are too weak for their action to be perceptible? Governments—their former power is often gone, and, as in

our own case, they are crippled by disagreement with the nation they profess to govern, or at any rate by the constant uncertainty how long such agreement as there is may last. This is not confined to the more popular governments, or it is ceasing to be confined. Besides, all governments are so at variance with surrounding governments that they find it, even the strongest of them, a perilous thing to act.

Diplomacy—recent events have not strengthened our reliance on its power. It may be that in this present emergency it may prove that it still retains some usefulness, and can give Europe another respite; but confidence in its success stands low, and yet it has put all its energies in motion.

The religious organisation of the West—the Roman Catholic Church—can that offer us union? As diplomacy sinks into effeteness can Rome regain its power, and in this latter day supersede that which stepped into the place it had left vacant. The immediate difficulty which presses upon Europe answers the question in the negative. It is true that the Papacy holds aloof from the vehement onslaught on the Turkish power, grateful for its tolerant protection, in such strong contrast with the oppressive action of the Byzantine creed—of the Russian Czar-Pope. But it must run counter to its whole doctrine, belie all its antecedents, be untrue to many of its noblest memories, ere it can deal with Islam on equal footing and openly espouse its cause. Be the struggle between the two faiths explicit or implicit, in either case the Romish Church must, if it would exist, be a party—not an impartial arbitrator. With a theological religion all purely human motives can but temporarily be taken into account—sooner or later the one supreme motive must assert its supremacy.

The newer power of industry may be credited with being in its own nature peaceful, though, as is seen by reference to English policy, and as it is written on the more recent history of Europe, it has been too intimately associated with, and the cause of, war. But it does not as peaceful produce union. It is the fertile source, on the contrary, of national jealousies and heartburnings, and will continue to be so until informed by a different spirit. The illusions which some quarter of a

century back were so prevalent, the illusions connected with free trade are at an end. Even the doctrines which were then thought to have received their death blow are again in the ascendant in many of the most important countries—nay, if I mistake not, in our own colonies, where, I may add, no peace, no common dependence, no community of race, language or interest, can overcome the intensity of their mutual jealousies. This is but a fresh instance of the truth that changes in respect to material interests can only be of real value to mankind when they follow, not precede, the moral change which alone can ensure their soundness and permanence. So long as self-interest, personal or national, is alone appealed to, there is almost a certainty that the lower and more immediate conception of it will overpower the higher and more remote. This evil is naturally more intense at a period when national isolation is being pushed to an extreme extent, and when industrially, no less than politically, it is considered the normal state to look exclusively to the separate interests of each of the competing nations. I am speaking of the more visible currents of opinion and of action, not unaware that there are deeper ones which, more in conformity with the better tendencies of the past, are bearing us silently, yet strongly to a more desirable condition. Never more than at present did we need to remember that the true direction which human affairs are taking is seldom identical with the apparent one, generally has been very contrary to it, and as a rule has escaped the observation of those most interested in it and thought to be most competent to discern it.

The various nations and religions which divide the habitable globe and its beliefs are so thrown into juxtaposition at present, that we naturally pass, in thought, out of the mere Western world, and for a moment examine whether there is any other religious creed or church which can hold out any hope. If, for reasons often stated, we reject the Islamic Monotheism, there remains only the Jewish, to which more than one recent writing has called attention. At least this is the only monotheism which has been a basis of union for a long period between men, the groundwork of a polity, the bond of a nation's existence. The judgment of Christians

of whatever denomination has decided against the faith which lies at the root of their own, has decided that no pure Monotheism is acceptable. Whatever the feature of the Jewish race and its venerable creed, it is not probable that it will be so far inconsistent with its past as to become capable of extension and comprehension. Nor would there seem any ground on which we could refuse to acquiesce in the decision of St. Paul, whose heart's desire and prayer it was that Israel might be saved, who could wish himself accursed from Christ for his brethren. We are not concerned with the grounds of that decision, but see that he recognised the impossibility of his own national faith being the faith of mankind. The pure formless Theism in which some minds take refuge, has not as yet shown any power of binding men together, whether it be an offshoot of Brahminism or of Christianity.

And if the Monotheisms which have issued from the Polytheisms are of no avail, we may not go back with any expectation of a fruitful result on those Polytheisms themselves. An obstacle rather than a rival to any Catholicism will be found in Pantheism, which attracts in the absence of any more definite faith, and will continue to attract where vague religious aspirations are thought sufficient, without any embodiment in dogma or practice. But in such indefiniteness we may be well assured that no large community of men will find rest, much less than it can constitute the union of the whole aggregate of communities. There is left the primeval and still existent faith of man—the Fetichist, in a more or less organic state; and this is destined to perpetual existence, surviving all the more transitory forms of human belief, and incorporated into the Religion of the Future.

Seeing the gradual decay of all existing forces, the gradual overthrow of all institutions, both under the influence of opinion, some are led to ask themselves whether any other power is wanted, whether public opinion in its progressive improvement, which is undeniable, may not be trusted for our guidance in the future, without our giving ourselves any trouble to elaborate any distinct creed or organ. The dominant modes of thought and feeling foster this idea; it gratifies the very general intellectual laziness and the

prevailing indiscipline. And it is strengthened by the just conviction that opinion is an agency of real force. It is, in fact, the necessary condition of great changes either for destruction or construction; but it is not more than this condition; it needs to be embodied, in some form or other, even if the work be to destroy, much more if it be to build up. If no adequate expression present itself, opinion shifts and floats uncertain, and often, as is but too plainly the lesson of modern European history, sets for a time in a counter direction to that from which it started.

In a word, our review leads to the conviction that there is nowhere, actually, any sufficient protection against the evils which seem to impend over Humanity in the immediate present. Disunion is the order of the day. It is a time of doubt and gloom, in which it is much easier to assure ourselves that such and such sufferings are inevitable for this generation and its proximate successors, than to cherish any hope that they will be averted. In fact, it is difficult not to feel that they are not also necessary in the other sense of indispensable; that, to use the expression of one of our statesmen in the troubles of the seventeenth century, 'Things must be worse before they are better.' The prevalent tone is one of cheerful security that all will be well, and dislike of those who are of the contrary mind. And with the very considerable number of exceptions—a number happily largely on the increase—the uppermost feeling is a resigned and somewhat hopeless acquiescence in the coming of great changes, with no apprehension of the means by which these changes may be guided; probably even with the feeling that any attempt at guidance is a waste of exertion. The revolution must just take its course.

From one quarter only comes a different sound, a note of triumph, jarring on all our nobler feelings. You will turn at once in thought to another meeting held on this day, the gorgeous pageant in which the English intruder celebrates what he considers the consecration of his Indian empire—the durbar at Delhi, where is to be proclaimed the accession of our Queen to the throne of the Mogul,—the permanent imposition of the English rule. I may find another occasion of entering more fully on this subject. But I may not.

And whilst I would speak in the tone which is most consonant with our present object, and with the considerations naturally suggested by this Festival of Humanity, I cannot let slip the opportunity it gives me of speaking. In other minds I see that the act, be it that of our young Viceroy, or of his chiefs at home, or of the Queen, excites grave misgivings on the score of policy, the only ground which the immense majority of our countrymen would recognise as to be taken into account. We occupy a different position. We can afford to pass by any considerations of policy, of costliness, or even the more serious one which I see is pleaded in the Indian papers, of the indecency of this splendid ceremonial in the face of the extending area of a famine-stricken population. We can openly condemn this triumphant assertion of our Imperial domination on the score of morality, as the condonation of a long, scarcely broken, series of crime, crimes of violence or of fraud, by which we have built up the structure. We may not live to see, any more than the legendary prophet was supposed to live to see, the destruction of the golden-fronted image of the royal dream with its feet of clay; but we can raise our voice against the acceptance by England of that structure in any other spirit than that which I well believe animates many of the noblest amongst the English who administer India—the spirit of self-denying, self-sacrificing, most unobtrusive, labour in atonement for the past, in preparation for the more complete atonement of the future, if we are fortunate enough to have the opportunity given us of making it by the restitution of India to the Indians. What a perversion of the moral judgment of the nation does it not betoken, that, deaf to all the just blame which has accompanied well nigh each single act of our acquisition, it accepts the whole result, whilst its leaders, almost without exception, thinkers or official men, cling to it as the very keystone of national greatness! This moral blindness seems to me the worst retribution of our Indian misdeeds. At once ungenerous and immoral, this act of national pride is an outrage to right human sentiment as the expression of the sacrifice of one country to the interest of another. No handwriting on the wall may trouble the ceremony; but the ultimate judgment is not the less

certain, and the power is forming to give that judgment effect.

The lessons of the past year, equally with all the thoughts suggested by the troubled present, lead me to return on part of what I said at our last annual meeting, on our relation to the Catholicism of the Middle Ages, the second or spiritual Empire of Rome, the western half of the great Monotheistic movement which, founded on Judaism, succeeded the Roman Empire in the direction of the more progressive portion of mankind. The more we attend to it, the more we shall see how largely we are in unison with it, notwithstanding the differences which separate us from it. And this is true, not merely when we look at it as the mediæval religion which has in principle lost the direction it once had, and survives at first sight rather as an obstacle than as an instrument of further advance. Whatever the degree of its decline, however near it may be to its fall, its existence is not without its uses and may be to us of great advantage. For two amongst many reasons. First, it keeps alive the sense of a higher spiritual union passing beyond the narrowing influences of nationalism, and protesting against the oppressive action of the pure state or temporal power. Secondly, it proclaims, and to a degree successfully enforces, a discipline, when, outside it, all sets in favour of the total desuetude of all discipline. I need not linger on the many counter-vailing evils which impair the value of these two contributions. We are in no danger of losing sight of them; we are in no danger of becoming Roman Catholics; so that we may unhesitatingly use it so far as we can, and judge it without disparagement.

Indirectly, again, is the system not of use under quite another aspect, as furnishing us with the necessary resistance? Conceive the Romish Church and all that it carries with it withdrawn from the West, and ourselves in presence of no church organisation with any coherence—I think we should have a sense as it were of working in a vacuum, where our exertions seemed to produce no result—the medium yielding most readily, but retaining no trace of any action upon it. In this respect it is possible that the renewed energy of the Papacy may be of benefit to us, though not in this respect

only. Far more beneficial may be that renewal and all the force which we must allow still to exist in the Roman Catholic Church, if it lead us, on a friendly study, to see in what that force lies, and to endeavour to attain it for ourselves, with the necessary modifications. I say a friendly study, for there can be no motive to hostility. What is Roman Catholicism but the first attempt, the term involves a certain amount of failure, at a Religion of Humanity, that first solution of a difficult problem, which in all the creations of man is the great difficulty, the capital step—on which when taken it is comparatively easy to return, examine it, see the causes of the success attained and of the failure, and renew the effort under better conditions, with fuller knowledge. From this point of view the whole history of the religion of St. Paul becomes part of our own history—the history I mean of our own religion; no impassable gulf separates us from our immediate predecessors; there is no breach of continuity between us. We follow as men follow, on a dangerous navigation, the track of those who have gone before them, with a sense of the community of object and of risk, with admiration for the skill shown in avoiding or surmounting difficulties, with sorrow when the marks of failure are perceptible, with the sense finally, that if they succeed it is because of the antecedent attempt. The early beginnings of Catholicism, its most gradual creation as a system, its recognition as a necessity and a protection by the instincts of mankind, its entry on its full power, its use and its loss of that power, its prolonged duration in spite of that loss—each of the varied incidents of its long career has its interest for us, as a part of the experience of which we would avail ourselves, and by the help of which we can hope to escape many of the delays and deviations to which without such guidance we should be exposed. We have much to correct in that experience; but the goal we would reach remains the same. We have but to fit ourselves more adequately for the undertaking, and then we may safely adopt the spirit and much of the method of our predecessors. Or we may put it in this way: For some generations Humanity worked for a given end, with certain means under certain conditions. In our and subsequent generations she will work to the same end.

Our task is one of addition to, not one of a total rejection of, the results already attained, or of adaptation with a change of means and conditions—the two main factors remain, the worker and the object.

Where is then our difference with Roman Catholicism as the representative form of the Christian Monotheism? Why do we seek, not directly to affiliate ourselves to it, but to substitute our worship and our doctrine for those which it offers? Why do we not suffer ourselves to be absorbed into it, but rather in all our language show that we consider ourselves as absorbing it? For no amount of agreement or of favourable judgments can conceal the fact, that this is the relation in which we seek to stand towards it, that we consider it as the imperfect which has to merge in the more perfect, as the inferior religion which has to make way ultimately for the superior. The one fundamental difference is soon stated: It rests on the assumption of a God, and we dispense with that assumption. The centre of its system is a superhuman being—the centre of ours is human. At first sight the difference involves an appearance of greater strength in the older faith, as it seems to offer a greater support to its believers. But as no tangible evidence of the reality of such support comes to maintain their belief, and as the results when tested seem more distinctly such as might be attained by man alone, and in no way correspond with the lofty hopes excited by the idea of an omnipotent auxiliary, the apparent strength issues in real weakness, and the faith which avowedly rests on merely human aids becomes a more solid comfort to those who adopt it. Our strength and our weakness are matters for a sober estimate—there is no invisible factor which may derange all our calculations. In this distinction lies the supreme difficulty of our task, from the hold which custom has given to the older and provisional conception, as well as from the greater ease which the mind has in grasping it. The associations which have grouped around it are an additional obstacle, as they are interwoven with so much of the highest spiritual tradition of the race. We need not doubt, however, but that we have ample means for meeting this difficulty, and for transferring the allegiance of man to the newer Religion.

Now that I have guarded myself sufficiently, I may, without misgiving, resume the more congenial treatment of Mediæval Catholicism as the most valued of all the antecedents which compose the transition—the most valued as the most akin, and the most instructive. It was, I repeat, the first answer to the question:—Can there be a religion of Humanity, comprehending all human beings? It built, as it could not but build, with the materials at hand, with the Monotheistic idea which had long prevailed in one nation, and towards which the others who were to adopt it had been working. But it humanised that idea as far as it could, and in the human element it introduced it found the universal bond it needed. The tie was a personal one, at the time it could not be otherwise. But it sufficed for the immediate need—and was found by St. Paul capable of giving the foundation on which the inheritors of his conceptions could raise the superstructure which we know as the Roman Catholic Church—the Church of the Western portion of the Empire. As such it was able to receive the new nations which occupied that portion, to prevent their entire rupture with the past, and to form out of the confused mass the comparatively orderly system of modern Europe. More it could not do, and the comparison of that to which it aspired and that which it effected is a satisfactory proof of the inherent, congenital weakness of the basis on which it rested—of the inadequacy of its doctrinal system.

Worship and organisation—they were admirably adapted to the ends in view, and they still preserve so much efficacy and confer such power as to convince us that we must look elsewhere for the origin of the failure. Their great power is the most formidable obstacle in our path, as they form such an attraction to the minds which, weary of the actual disorder, seek shelter and repose, and find the imposing fabric of the Romish Church open to afford them both—with no rival in the field. Naturally they accept its offers. This case will become more and more common, and can only be met by an analogous organisation. Here again then we come upon an indication of the real work we have to do, an useful lesson taught us by the earlier Catholicism.

But the power it exercises is mainly confined to its original

home, and when confronted with other great religious constructions fails almost entirely, or gains what small success it does gain by sacrificing the foundation on which, in the last resort, it must rest its claims. At some point or other it must come into irreconcilable opposition with the cardinal dogmas of the other religions. In the immediate crisis, for instance, it can adopt a more conciliatory attitude towards the Mohammedan power than other Christian bodies, but its final judgment must be as condemnatory as theirs.

On this, however, I do not wish to insist at present further than is necessary. The object is briefly to indicate both its strong and its weak points—both in order to show its value as it presented itself to the mind of the founder of the true—the definitive—Religion of Humanity. The affinities and differences of his construction in relation to its predecessor may be easily understood if we take the pains to study it. The affinities are strongest in reference to its strongest part—the difference is complete in reference to its weakest. Cult and organisation—there we largely assimilate the results of Catholicism—so that the expression that we are but a parody of it has a certain show of truth to the superficial observer. It would ill become us needlessly to set aside any of the traditions of Humanity. With the doctrinal system we are in entire discord, as tending to defeat its own true end, as narrowing it from universal to local, as forbidding it to justify its name of Catholic. With the spirit of its discipline we are profoundly agreed, though free to alter much of its outward expression.

Every great religious construction must have its roots in the past, must use what is, not seek an entirely new order. It must, as has been said, grow up under the wings of that which it succeeds, and which it aims at superseding by its very existence. So it was with St. Paul—so it was with Mohammed—the two great historical religions, that is, religions of which we have the history recorded. So it was with Auguste Comte, the inheritor of their joint construction, the continuer of their labours—the realiser of their aspirations. He was a creator in the sense in which any other eminent genius has been a creator, he adapted to new and larger uses existing materials. Penetrating to the very inmost core of

their conceptions and stripping them of all that was accidental, he brought into full light what there was of common to them and of universal interest to the race which they had served. He took up the task they had left unachieved, but profited by the efforts they had made towards its achievement. I need not here stop to explain how he profited by much else. I am following the strictly religious tradition. Keeping steadily before him their aim, he examined their results—with no wish to separate himself from them—with every wish to use them to the utmost and incorporate them in a new and skilful joining with his own work. He stood upon the old ways—interpreted the past—and sought at every possible point to effect its continuity with the newer order of the present and the future. The materials which he used in this spirit were rich—he had but to shape and adjust them afresh in the light of one great master idea—one paramount synthetic conception. In this lay his own especial contribution by virtue of which he passes into high precedence over St. Paul and Mohammed; their successor, but their master and their judge—and as the latter, the true establisher and explainer of their greatness. We thus see how entirely he is identified with the continuous advance of Humanity in the province of religious thought. We can understand why he draws so freely from past accumulations. We can see what it was which enabled him to be so elaborate, so articulate in his plan of the new religious order, why it was that what in others had been tentative and gradual, he was enabled to present to us as systematic and complete. It is, perhaps, above all, the unhistorical Protestantism which has exerted so narrowing an influence on English thought, that causes the difficulty there is to many minds in recognising this conclusion.

So much as bearing on the direct connection of the Religion of Humanity with previous efforts in the same sense. They have failed so utterly as to be a source of dissension while aiming at the contrary. This is but too evident at the present time. But it is long since they ceased to afford any prospect of real union, not of to-day or yesterday. Some wider scheme with less of innate repulsion, is the want, and it is for our religion to show its competence

to meet that want. It has one advantage which the first of the two great questions of immediate importance places in a clear light. I have before alluded to the attitude necessarily assumed by the mediæval religion to its rival, Islam, and the founder of Islam. We may interpret in our own way, or recoil from, the vivid but frightful presentment of Mohammed in the twenty-eighth canto of the *Inferno*; but in its inner substance, the judgment of Dante which that terrible image embodies is the logical conclusion of the Christian monotheism. The firm believer in Catholicism as the sole possibility for uniting the whole human family must condemn with extreme rigour Mohammed, as having thrown a hindrance of singular effectiveness in the way of such union. No personal greatness, no services could atone for such a wrong. The sceptical literary mind may reverse the unfavourable judgment, and absolve on the ground of personal merit; but whilst it lacks either the power or the courage to renounce its Christian or theistic basis, it is hampered by its inconsistency, and can secure but a slight assent to its verdict. Still, as at the close of the Middle Ages, the consistent Christian theologian must accept substantially the sentence of Dante. No Pope or Bishop could openly redeem him, as Trajan was redeemed from hell by Gregory. It is only from the human point of view, and with the formal decision of the Religion of Humanity, that the great Arabian Prophet attains his just position, in full harmony with all our principles, as one of the most eminent servants and benefactors of mankind. The illustration may show us the vantage ground occupied by a purely human religion. It can have no quarrel with the religious growths of the past, be they what they may. They vary widely in nobleness and in the extent and character of the benefits they confer; but they are all equally results of our common human nature, forward strivings towards better things, to be assisted and raised, not to be condemned. The fullest perfection Humanity can reach will never be discontinuous with its primeval extreme imperfection; not in another world, and under a total change of conditions, is her state of glory, but under all the actual circumstances must she advance towards it in unbroken progress as she has hitherto advanced. The respect, there-

fore, with which she looks upon her various affluents implies no effort, no concession, no toleration; but is simply a partial expression of her self-respect, flows from her very nature, is inseparable from her idea. She has nothing to forgive, nothing to be forgiven to her, no memories of wrongs or insult to efface. Her vicegerents have been made the ground of quarrels; and thereby the triumph of any one of them has been rendered equally impossible and odious. Those who speak in her name have no such associations to overcome, no barriers but those of ignorance and insufficient preparation to remove; when, that is, we duly distinguish between any given religion and the passions of its disciples.

‘Think not that I am come to send peace on earth. I came not to send peace, but a sword.’ Such is the language of the Christ of the Gospels; and in the immediate comment on it which follows there is something which must be applicable to all religious changes, the one which we aim at not excepted. As any such change makes its way, it will be accepted by some, rejected by others; and our own experience amply justifies the statement that such acceptance and rejection bring pain and strife with them, as it does the other statement, that a man’s foes shall be they of his own household. This is the natural result of the closeness of the connection and the necessarily stronger sense of the division which has crept in. But whilst allowing that we have this in common with other similar movements, I cannot but think that, in our case, so far as we ourselves are concerned, the evil assumes a much lighter form. What must it have been to the early convert to Christianity to see his dearest relatives abiding by their earlier faith and incurring all those consequences from which he himself escaped with fear and trembling! Again, he could not avoid the strongest condemnation of much of his former life and of those who still adhered to its ways. The opposition was most sharp and painful. The two parties could come to no mutual understanding. We are not in the same case. We can understand, sympathise with, and respect, the belief we have left. The practices that belief inculcates we can share, often revive; and whilst regretting that others miss the benefits of our faith, feel neither alarm nor anger. Possibly there may be a slight excess in the other direction, and the ease which

our relative judgment gives us may be open to abuse; but that we are comparatively easy is certain. Others may be uneasy or indignant with us, and we may dislike or resent such feelings, but we cannot share them.

The words quoted, however, bear a less private interpretation. The Prince of Peace, one of the titles of the Messiah, has been seen by many Christian thinkers to be at variance with the facts of Christian history. Christianity has been far from a religion of peace, either internally or externally. The sword has indeed been sent, the fire kindled; and looking at it in the present it certainly is not a message of peace, any more than it has been. Judged as we judge it, as an exclusively human creation, it could not be otherwise. Nor can it be. It has pretensions which must ever be a source of disturbance, even if they do not too often lead to open war. The proclamation of peace on earth which has been ineffectual in its hands, from the force of circumstances, becomes the property of its successor, as does the other half of the announcement—goodwill towards men. As the cry of hatred and contempt rises from Christendom against the Moslem, even in these days of unbelief or indifference, we feel the hopelessness of any permanent peace or goodwill till the rival faiths be merged in one to which a peaceful character attaches by its very definition.

Such a faith we have, and the question is, how to spread it? Human unwisdom and crime so complicate matters that its propagation is rendered indescribably difficult, were it simply by our having to meet simultaneously problems which should present themselves in gradual and peaceful succession. Our first object must be, not to act on the East, but to influence and unite the West; and the absence of any true statesmanship has brought the West prematurely into extended and oppressive contact with the East, whether European or Asiatic; as in the West itself it has adjourned, in the name of contemptible interests, the thorough investigation of all higher social and moral questions. But this course of events does not change, though it enhance, the arduousness of our task. Neither our own weakness, nor the strength of the opposing forces, should divert us from that which seems to be our duty and our policy—the insisting directly on our

Religion in its fullest proportions as the one remedy for the evils under which all are suffering. To that we must come at last, and all half-measures do but strengthen our opponents. In practical politics opportunism, as it is called, may have its time—even in urging our Religion we may allow for it in a very limited degree—but in reference to the general course to be pursued what is indicated by the term is not for us. The world urgently demands a synthesis, an universal conception which may serve to co-ordinate all the partial ones, an unity in which all differences, national or religious, may be conceived as gradually sinking. Leaving the somewhat narrow issue raised by this unhappy Turkish imbroglio, what can free us from all the foolish and pernicious antagonism in which all our traditional reasonings and language tend to place the European and the Asiatic, what can prevent our reaping the consequences of that antagonism, but the comprehension of both alike, and the suppression of their supposed ineradicable differences in the unity of Humanity—her unity in the past—are not we Asiatic by origin?—her unity in the future, such unity to be the result of our communication to the kindred races from whom we separated, and through them to more distant branches, of the products of our advance.

The successors of St. Peter speak to Rome and to the world, *urbi et orbi*. The successors of Auguste Comte speak (the change is only in appearance slight) to the West and to the world—*occidenti et orbi*. And as the Popes have ever found their greatest difficulty nearest home, in their first and closest audience, so, unquestionably, with us, the really arduous part of our task is in relation to the more limited of the two great terms—the West. Its conversion to the Religion of Humanity would guarantee, and that speedily, a similar result over the habitable globe. But the Western world lies in extreme political disunion, in social disunion, in religious disunion, and to the general observer, in hopeless disunion under all three aspects. Evidently the last of the three is the most capital. If removed, we have a pledge of the removal of the others; so long as it exists, the removal of the others would at the most be but an unsatisfactory palliative. Nay more, it would be undesirable, beyond a certain easily-reached limit. Unmodified by a

religious change, the united West would be most likely to exert a most oppressive influence on all the weaker nations. The unsatisfactoriness is seen by all religious minds, and hence the revival which may be traced, both of interest in all religious questions and of activity in the professors of the received doctrines. Hence, above all, the revival to which I have often alluded of the Roman Catholic energy. Nor is there the slightest probability that such a reanimation of the older creeds, which seemed well nigh extinct, will pass away, till the want which has led to it be fully satisfied. All other hopes have either been tried and found wanting, or if there exists one which has escaped notice, it will be tried and found wanting. Revolution in the political, revolution in the social world, neither can give us what we ask for—what all are asking for; the last, if relied on, will leave us as the first is acknowledged to have left us, unsatisfied and enfeebled by the disappointment of our expectations when proved to be illusions. Such experience as we have had of it, not, it is true, on so large a scale as of the former, and therefore, unfortunately, not so accepted as conclusive, tends to show that, under whatever speciousness of promise, this is the ultimate certainty.

All our own doctrines, all the action of our worthiest opponents, combine to enforce on us the wisdom of centring our energies on the propagation of our Religion, making everything else subordinate and secondary. Not the political government of the world, but its religious direction—such is necessarily our aim if we would escape the imminent evil of a long adjournment of our triumph, inevitable as that triumph is in the course of ages. If we cannot replace the Catholicism of the Middle Ages, we must make up our minds to succumb to it; it must for a time regain in large measure its former hold.

In this respect, the second of the two questions of immediate practical urgency, which I mentioned in the earlier part of my remarks, is full of instruction for us—I mean the present condition of France, a condition in advance, it is true, but still typical, of that which is to be traced elsewhere throughout the West, even in the United States, where on first thoughts we should least have looked for it.

It is Roman Catholicism which constitutes the sum and substance of the difficulties of France—Catholicism in presence of strong dislike, of strong resistance, but not in presence of a substitute to take its place. And with the necessary changes the problem will be essentially the same for our own and other Protestant countries—only in France the evil is in the acute state—affects every movement in politics and government. Elsewhere, as a rule, it is more remote, and, therefore, is considered out of the sphere of observation. But recognising, as we here do, the intimate solidarity of the different constituents of the West, the line of conduct to be adopted is the same for all; at any rate the action of the disciples of the Religion of Humanity ought to be the same in all—as the principles on which we judge are the same. So long as the above description of the position of the Papal organisation is the true one, so long as it is met with negations, or by a resistance which in the main bears on the political or social evils of our time—so long will it continue to grow, and that partly, if not mainly (it can be shown) as a direct consequence of this particular character of the resistance. For now, as during the whole period of Rome's decline, one strong support of her power is found in the selfish interests bound up with the old political and social order, and whilst the resistance to her wears principally the form of the assertion of the new, within the same limits, all those interests, be the convictions of their representatives what they may, rally to her assistance. Whereas by transporting our resistance to the ground of religion, we do not, it is true, in any way disarm our real antagonist, but we present ourselves as her rivals in the protection, in principle, of the interests which before fancied themselves endangered. We raise no other real opposition but that which we cannot avoid, the irreconcilable opposition of a different creed, which can only cease with the gradual extinction of that creed. The issue is simplified and rendered distinct.

By this course we manifest to all what is our real aspiration, what it is we offer. And it is not easy to get men to see this. It is but the few who recognise that what faces them is not a philosophical system, with certain undefined social bearings, but a new Religion and a Church, with all the

attributes connoted by the term. Numbers, of course, do not wish to see this, and lose no opportunity of throwing scorn on it in order to divert attention from it, for they recoil instinctively from its effects. But there are others who are in search of something of the kind, because their earlier belief has become dead. They are kept from examining our offer by misconception or by simple ignorance, the not knowing, I mean, that we have anything which could possibly meet their wants, give them an object of worship, provide them with a system of life. They are looking for light, not mere intellectual light, though not averse to that, but the higher light of a great religious idea, which shall infuse into all their existence the unity and the beauty which at present they feel denied to them. And, few as we are, there are yet enough of us, if we all felt the same and acted in complete unison, to draw these strugglers after light to that which we ourselves enjoy, but which, if we do not avoid the misdirection of our efforts, we are but too likely to enjoy alone.

It is our bounden duty to see that this happen not, that to the utmost of our power our light shine forth, our practical object become known, the existence of the Church of Humanity become an admitted fact—a church ready to welcome all comers, to give rest and support to all who are in need of it, as also to find scope for the unresting intellect and the vigorous activity. The bruised reed must we not break, the smoking flax must we not quench—not the strong only and the unsullied, but the weak, the suffering, the fallen, the weary and the heavy laden—must find rest to their souls. Watch the Church of Rome when she passed from her period of preparation and entered that of government. See how she dealt with the rough and impure elements which the new nations converted to her sway offered her.

We are bound to confront the organisations of the past with an organisation, under penalty of failure in all our objects, and it can only confront them hopefully by offering more than they did, on a surer foundation. Such organisation must necessarily be religious, for religion is the only permanent bond.

I hold it for certain that if this conviction were paramount

with all our members, wheresoever found, our progress would be comparatively rapid. By paramount, I understand, that it were expressed in all their actions and language. Our religion is, we know, we feel it is, the birth of time. Everything that is which lies deepest in human nature and human society sets in its favour. If unduly delayed in its course, it must be by the shortcomings of its advocates and disciples. I have said enough to indicate where I think the danger lies of our coming short, in our deficient concentration on the religious as opposed to the social and political aspects of our cause.

It was remarked to me the other day, as I think with truth, that it is probable that Auguste Comte, living and thinking and writing in the presence of Humanity, of the being whom he had revealed, realised her existence in a degree which we have not yet reached, and drew from her an inspiration which we find it difficult to appreciate. For we have not penetrated so far into her sanctuary, drunk so deeply of the wisdom which such consciousness of her presence could give us. But it should be our wish to do so more and more; to bring home to our thoughts and hearts the majestic unity which would illumine both to an extent of which our former religious conceptions, profound and sincere as they may have been, can be but the faint anticipation. True human wisdom would surpass in beauty no less than in reality the beatific vision of the saints of old.

Men have said and written high and beautiful things of the objects of their adoration, and the expression of them is the possession of man for ever. But those objects we see to have been their own creation, the projection of themselves, though they gave them an existence external to themselves. If we accept as the only real object of human adoration, outside man, the Humanity by virtue of which he exists, the whole of which he is a part, we shall be led to see, that suppressing what is purely chimerical, and here and there some anti-social accretions or developments, whatever there has been in the past of beautiful expression, consecrated to the service of the provisional guides of men, may be with the fullest right applied, is, properly speaking, applicable only to Humanity. This will be more felt as we grow older in her

service, and as her kingdom more visibly sets aside all others. But for our own growth we may act on it at present, and accustom ourselves to kindle our languid devotions by awakening in ourselves with regard to her the associations which attach to the most sublime utterances of our former creed. A certain prudence may at first be necessary—in the free spontaneity of our private worship we shall each of us be able to listen to the voice of such prudence—but we may proceed with considerable boldness in the direction indicated, and its amount may be a test of our general advance in our new religious life. We should probably begin by finding the new adaptation incongruous and unwarranted, so strongly are we yet in the grasp of our past; but this feeling would before long wear off, and we should have become possessed of a fresh and valuable aid to our faith.

I specify this general remark by a reference to our treatment of the 'Imitation of Christ,' from which I am in the habit of reading passages here. The experience of those who use it will, I know, in some cases bear me out as to the gradual disappearance of the difficulty they at first felt in the conversion of this theological manual into a work for the uses of Positivist or human devotion.

The full completeness of its synthetic conception under the form admissible for its writer we surely may adapt to ourselves under the new and more perfect synthesis which we have received. The entire self-devotion, the losing oneself in the object of adoration, the single-minded consecration to the service chosen—all these we may aim at and transfuse into our being from the pages of the great mystical writer of the fifteenth century, finding aid in the wider character of the service, the nobler object of our worship, the more rational justification for self-devotion. And no difficulty meets us such as met him, and is the source of such narrowness, such occasional taint of selfishness as there may be. We have no call to stand apart from others, to isolate ourselves from the world. There is an element of truth doubtless even in this part of his work, and one which it were wise to seek for and not neglect; but, in general, we are not bound down as he was by his distinct profession and his ordinary Christian principles to the language of solitary devotion, to the exclusion

of all ordinary human subjects from his communion with his God. And the effort and strain which must always attach to the communion of the creature with his creator, of man with God, from the disparity which man must recognise when he assigns that God an objective existence, these cease for us. We are one with the power we serve; we are in communion as men with Humanity; we have only to draw out the simple natural consequences of the relation which cannot but exist. With these differences all in our favour, no height or depth of fervour in the work need ultimately be alien to us, when by daily use we familiarise ourselves with it; when we can raise it from a personal into a purer social atmosphere; substitute the collective for the individual object; and see, more than was given à Kempis to see, the possibility for man of attaining that which he so fervently aspired to—the identification of the worshipper with the worshipped. So used, his feelings strengthen our own.

I question not that in due time our religious experience will find its own appropriate expression, one which will need no conversion or adaptation, but which shall directly meet the wants of the servants of Humanity. But we may grant this, and yet believe that at no time will men cease to draw benefits and support from a recurrence to the greater works of their predecessors—to such works, as from their intrinsic greatness, may be accepted as adequate representatives of the mass which it is necessary to put aside. All in our religion ensures this—above all, its ever-growing submission to the past: its increasing commemoration of the illustrious dead; its highest moral qualification as the religion of human sympathy.

What I have said of the 'Imitation' has been principally said to show how completely we can look on the past as our own, even when a first impression seems to point to the widest divergence. If it have the further object of leading any to an increased use, a more daily meditation of that work, so urged by our Master—in perfect agreement with the religious-minded of all Christian communions—such object is not foreign to my present purpose. All the means available for increasing the power of our religious life are connected with the one point on which I have wished to

insist, the desirability of concentrating ourselves on the religious aspect of our cause in all its comprehensiveness, whilst, so far as I could, I have wished to justify the claims of our Religion to such concentration by showing how on every side it meets the wants and absorbs the achievements of the race. Such, however imperfectly expressed, have been the ideas uppermost with me. I would use this Festival of Humanity to quicken our sense of her power, to awaken the longing for her triumph, to strengthen the conviction that in that triumph is the only hope of our race—the only consummation of its past labours. I would use it also to show, so far as I may, the yet militant members of her Church, those who can only lift up their eyes to the hills, those whose cry must ever be as yet, ‘How long?’ what she offers in this time of expectation, when we wait for the manifestation.

For the time, I said, is one of sadness or even of gloom when we look to the great disorder of human relations consequent on the absence of all true intellectual order, of all religious discipline; and it wears too much of the same character if we turn to our own more narrow sphere—the circle of our own personal relations. Sickness, sorrow, and death have been and are still busy amongst us, and the new year opens for many anxiously, for some even more than anxiously. The premature breaking of our early ties, the critical case in which we all stand, are, undoubtedly in large measure, traceable to the pervading social and religious disorganisation, in many cases most sensibly so—in some the connection is less evident. It is no dream to look forward to the large diminution of these evils which will accompany the establishment of a more coherent society. But, in the meantime, we have to bear them as those who have gone before us have borne them, as those in the midst of whom we live have to bear them, as in a degree the inevitable destiny of human existence, to be met with resignation. But whilst we accept, in common with all, this as our duty, we as much as any can look to our Religion for consolation and support. It gives us strength by the mere putting aside of vague hopes and uncertain judgments, and bringing us to the firm ground of our purely human con-

ditions. By so doing it gives additional force to the sense of complete community of lot with all that we see around us, and prevents any desire for exemption for ourselves. Even in death we would be gathered to our forefathers, of all ages and countries, leaving our work in life to aid those who follow us, so far as it has been good.

In the other trials of life, the benefits of our religion are not confined to the sense of large human communion, nor to the resignation which it enforces and ennobles. It should strengthen us by the power it gives us of understanding our condition, as it brings the whole existence of man into the field of our vision, and explains how far certain evils are necessary—how far they may be lessened by man's exertions. The clearness of insight which it should confer is a precious gift, if viewed only in its highest sphere as enabling us to attain a true and yet lenient construction of our fellow men—a just, if humble, estimate of ourselves. And, socially, in the strength of this intellectual insight we may be truly said to know in whom we have trusted—we can feel assured that if man disquieteth himself Humanity guides him—that she has passed through darker hours and will doubtless pass our present convulsions in safety.

Again, the Religion of Humanity strengthens us by the scope it gives for all our energy, showing us where it would be directed aright—where it would be wasted. As in its light we see the past unrolled before us and the future coming into view, we learn what has been done—what remains to do. What we bring may be but little, but it is a loss to the power we serve if we bring it not. No rightly-directed effort can be wasted; there is room for all. We may feel our own weakness, never that we have any superfluous strength. As the capabilities of our position rise before us, the, relatively speaking, boundless changes which may better the condition of mankind, a generation or an individual annulled or perverted becomes a ground for real regret. Thus consecrated to the service of the race, our humblest activity is dignified in our eyes, and the heavy pressure of the evils around us lightened by our struggle to lessen them, not for ourselves, it may be, but in some degree for our successors.

Lastly, and above all, in the moral region, we gain

strength from our Religion by its constant appeal to our nobler instincts; an appeal too as exclusive as it is constant, by virtue of the limits within which it moves—the limits of this world. I mean that, without unduly crushing, rather whilst using the personal instincts, it keeps them in their place by its fostering care of the others, not even allowing the personal the stimulus of direct compression. It urges us to rise out of ourselves, to seek salvation, not from the wrath to come, but from the ever-present danger of selfishness; not to narrow the range of our feelings to that which touches ourselves, but in a free and open spirit to extend them in all directions; to keep our sorrows to ourselves, to make others partakers in our joy; to blunt the edge of our own bitterness by making it serve to render us more acutely sympathetic with the sufferings of others. If so strengthened, we may bend almost to breaking beneath our trials, but they will leave us raised and purified.

I have treated this part of my subject with little reference to the claims of the co-existent faiths. In nothing do we come behind them. Whereinsoever any are bold, we are bold also. Are they Hebrews? so are we—are they Israelites? so are we—are they the seed of Abraham? so are we—are they ministers of Christ? so are we—we speak as fools, we are more. Those who are learning slowly yet deeply the power of the new faith they have adopted will testify that, on their way hitherto, it has not failed them, and that with each advance their confidence grows that it will not fail them; that through all the obstacles their past or their present may throw in their way, in spite of their own weakness or varied imperfection, it offers them that which they were in search of, unity in themselves, union with others, greater largeness of understanding and of heart. And when in the true spirit of their creed, they raise their eyes and travel round the wider horizon it opens to them, beyond the narrow bounds of family and country and particular time, they see how beyond all others it satisfies their highest wishes, how it alone has the promise which others have aspired to have, how it alone has the gift of universality, how it alone is truly catholic, for whilst others claim as it does the power of bringing all mankind into union in some distant future, and so of constituting

the unity, the religious unity of the human race, it, and it alone, can fearlessly and comprehensively go back upon the past, and embrace it in all its extent, without any exception, thus doing what they none of them have as yet claimed to do, thus justifying its higher pretensions to give union and unity by the actual giving of continuity, vindicating to the full by its possession of this eminent characteristic, its exclusive title to the name of Universal, its exclusive competence to be the Religion of Humanity, in the widest acceptation which the term can bear.

SERMON DELIVERED AT THE
POSITIVIST SCHOOL, 19 Chapel Street, Lambth Conduit Street, W.C.,
on the Festival of Humanity 89 (1 January, 1877).

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

ANNUAL ADDRESS.*

On the Festival of Humanity, 90 (1 January, 1878).

To one who looks at matters as I do there is but little change required in the language and estimate I offered last year as to current events. The older social forces, churches, governments, diplomacy or other, have not in the interval so acted as to increase our confidence in their efficacy. Disunion has not made way for union, disorder for order, but rather the contrary; the anarchy has grown. Human society is, we doubt not, underneath all the surface trouble, advancing towards a better, more settled state; but, as far as appearances go, it is advancing through a series of calamities, passing from one shock to another, without any skilful steering to diminish the force of each new collision. All seems to justify our belief that some new power must be evoked before any permanent satisfactory settlement can be reached.

If so, I need touch but slightly on the two more marked events of the year, the Eastern War and the struggle in France. Neither has much promise in it, whatever the view we take of them in relation to their more immediate course. The victory of Russia, or the successful resistance of Turkey, may be each of them assumed, and the consequences studied without in either case our finding that the modification resulting therefrom has, in any sensible degree, destroyed our liability to future complications. The struggle will, in all probability, have been a waste of effort and suffering; its issue not in any sense contributing to solve

* The commemorative form given on pp. 225, 226, applies also to this address.

any of the deeper-seated difficulties which embarrass the onward progress of Humanity. The centre of gravity of Europe may be displaced for a time, that is, or it may continue essentially as at present ; but there would be little reason to interest ourselves in either result, were it not that any real displacement will probably lead to a repetition of that which we have seen under similar circumstances before, a misdirection of exertion in order to remedy a mere outward and political evil when there is so much that more urgently demands our labour. On any larger view of human relations, the war, with its probable results, allowing for such compensations as always attend our complex activity, seems to me fraught, whichever way it end, with the gravest perils, as tending to rekindle when dormant, or excite to great bitterness, the older animosity of the two great historical continents, and to awaken, on the part of the smaller but more immediately active, dreams of ambition which alike in their success or failure must involve enormous misery to the inhabitants of both.

And again, whichever way it end, it must heighten the distrust with which one at least of the Western Powers and the great Power of Eastern Europe have been long regarding one another in consequence of their Asiatic position—a distrust for which the prevalent ideas in both countries allow no immediate remedy. Between Russia dominant in Western Asia, or seeking predominance, and England convulsively grasping her Indian empire, no real confidence is possible.

We must be content to share the general uncertainty as to the course of events and the action of our Government, and we wait probably with considerable difference of feelings and wishes for its declaration of its policy. Such is the state of public opinion that we cannot have much hope. Its division must embarrass any Government. And where it appears to be most agreed, it would point to a course of action which we all here, I well believe, shrink from—I mean our taking part in the present struggle only so far as to get some portion of the plunder. But whilst there is yet a doubt, I may express the hope that England, resolutely rejecting any such temptation, refusing to be guided by what is called her own interest merely, will remember that

the power she undoubtedly possesses is a trust for Humanity and more immediately for that Western portion of it to which her past so strongly binds her; that she will show by firm action, by war if need be, and by war even unsupported, that the system of mere force which it is again sought to bind upon Europe will meet, as on former occasions it has met, with her determined resistance. She has missed more than one occasion for such resistance; but there seems no likelihood of occasions not recurring. Nor can I think that, if with wisdom she availed herself of the one which is imminent, she would long remain without aid from other powers. But I pass with relief from this topic; for I feel that the expectation of any noble action is well-nigh futile; that so deeply have all the springs of our national morality been tainted by the crime-won empire to which the nation clings, or its governing classes at least, that we who advocate a policy independent of such considerations shall have to wait till that acquisition has worked its full work, and in the meantime shall have to watch in shame and sorrow a conduct which, whether it take the form of action or inaction, will be alike disgraceful.

We can fall back with comfort on other prospects, and on the conviction that the good or evil of the present time cannot affect the ultimate destinies of Humanity; that we, least of all men, need feel permanent discouragement amid the gloom which prevails—least of all men need exaggerate the amount or the tendencies of the embarrassments in which all are involved. By the operation of sure laws we are moving towards their clearance. So that we do all in our power to aid in this process and to avoid all avoidable waste, we may be content to look in faith for the effectual result of such operation.

The long struggle in France cannot but have deeply interested all our body; and, speaking generally, we have been agreed in our judgment of it, and in the wish that it should end, as it has done as yet, in the triumph of the Republic, and in an escape, if only for a time, from all violence. For time unquestionably works more in favour of the Republic than of either of its political competitors, and to gain time is therefore an object. Still is it possible to

look on the present settlement as anything but a lull in the real conflict, as any permanent conclusion of the many difficulties which beset France? It does not touch the one capital obstacle to all permanence, the religious division of the nation; and till that is effectually met, all else must remain uncertain. And herein would seem to lie the danger as regards this point, that whilst one of the two great parties sees this clearly, and is bending all its efforts with most logical consistency to strengthen itself as a religious organisation, its opponent has no clear conception of the true issue, and therefore none of the method to be pursued. It fights at a disadvantage, for it is hampered by its large concessions in principle to its antagonists, and turns with contempt, if they come within its ken, from the doctrines which might secure its victory.

Nor again, under the more superficial, more strictly political aspect can we here, as far as I can see, feel anything beyond the most moderate satisfaction in the present state, viz., the accession to power of a conservative government resting on the republican majority, in and outside of a parliament. All our convictions are alien to any confidence in the basis on which it is raised, the universal suffrage which is made the keystone of the political edifice—the appeal to number as the ultimate tribunal. The triumph of democracy brings us but little comfort, if for a time we acquiesce in it as the lesser evil. And the language of its leaders does not strengthen our hope. Scarcely a glimpse of anything that we are accustomed to look on as the true policy does it afford us;—a Church bound to the State,—an education controlled by the State, through its decrepit organ the University,—is there any reason to think that such ideas will be more fruitful of good result in the future than they have been in the past?

Add to such considerations the social difficulty, the fresh adjustment of all social relations which the newer order is inevitably furthering, and estimate the resistance which such a change must call out when the forces set in motion are only the old, well-strained, if not over-strained, forces of democracy and aristocracy, whilst whatever there is of higher influence mingles in the fray mainly on the side of the latter, an element of passion, not of calm, and we shall have ample grounds for

our opinion that France is yet far distant from its goal, is labouring through the storm with no competent pilot.

On one side, however, there is something to cheer us. All alike feel, so far as I see, that in the admirable bearing and self-restraint evinced by the mass of the French nation under the recent trial of its patience there lies a strong security for its future right direction; that all might be well, could such a population find leaders worthy of its confidence, true interpreters of its wants and aspirations. We ask ourselves with anxiety, Are there any such?

In this, as in all the rest, the problem, I feel sure, is entirely common to the Western world, and its being so intensifies the interest with which we watch the course of events in France, and study her evils and their remedies, whether the remedies practically offered or the truer ones which we may think might be offered. To us the cardinal inquiry seems to be, what will be the measure of liberty of expression which the government now in power will think it wise, or itself strong enough, to concede? will it feel itself strong enough to allow anything like an open discussion on equal terms of all the difficulties which are awaiting such treatment, and which can finally be removed only by such treatment? will it allow liberty of teaching to the adherents of all faiths? will it, lastly, modify with a gradual discretion the oppressive restrictions which now exist on the power of meeting and free speaking, so as to leave fair room for the influence of those powerful agencies?

If we turn from foreign policy, from the events which more immediately concern other nations though with the closest bearing on our own, and scrutinise the prospect at home, in the double sense in which such a term is applicable, to our action on others in the first place, to our own more strictly domestic action in the second, there are many points of interest, but which must not detain me long. Our relations with China are still unsettled. I believe that, for the second time, the English Government is submitting to the practical ratification of the commercial classes the treaty which its duly authorised representatives had concluded with China—a treaty, like all others we have extorted, by no means sinning on the side of just dealing towards that country and its

government. We know enough of the spirit which has animated our merchants throughout our disputes to be aware that nothing but their own immediate interest, as they view it, will guide their decision: the welfare of the nation with which they have to deal will in no way affect them. And we have reason therefore to look with anxiety on the future—to expect a renewal of the unjust, oppressive, interference which has been the rule of our conduct hitherto. There is more of resistance to such interference in the feeling of the non-commercial public than there has been; but commerce is strong; and we have seen the weakness of our government in a former case, and may well fear to see it again.

Whilst on this subject I may mention that our address* to the Chinese ambassador, drawn up in the early part of last year, could not, I was informed by his secretary, be officially received, for diplomatic reasons; but unofficially, his concurrence in most of it, and his satisfaction in it, as an additional proof of a friendly spirit towards his government, with some reasons for partial dissent, were communicated to me; so that it was evident that the memorial had received a full consideration. I shall print it with this discourse, as it was never meant to be otherwise than public, and it is in their publicity that lies the value of such documents. The most interesting observation of the ambassador's was his admission that, in his judgment, all had not been done that should have been done by the Imperial court to check the home growth of opium, and that the opposition here in England to its importation deserved to have its hands strengthened by a more vigorous action in China.

As in China, so in Japan, we still enforce treaty provisions which were dictated by our own commercial interest, in utter disregard of the fair claims of those on whom we enforce them. We still claim rights which we should never concede to others. They constitute a permanent strain upon all peaceful relations; a permanent source of irritation where a friendly spirit might, it is clear, be evoked by a different course. But turn where we will when we are dealing with this order of questions, it is essentially the same thing we see, the assertion of an inherent superiority of the European,

* See p. 1.

more strictly of the English race, which qualifies it, in its own eyes, for trampling on all others where it is strong enough to trample on others. The distant prospect is held out, that if they will not resist or rebel,—this last is the formula for all independent tribes which are averse to submission to our rule—we shall give them what we consider good government, which too often means the protection of men of our own colour in their extorting from others all the services human beings can render to them in their blind pursuit of wealth. What wonder that with conduct based on such assumptions we are in constant trouble in all quarters of the globe? The latest is this Cape disturbance, in settling which I see that all the approved methods of imperial extension, all the well-known pretexts, are being put forward in a way calculated to excite all our suspicions as to the justice of our cause. We may ask, Where is it all to end? Coveting Egypt at one extreme, spreading our rule by high-handed annexations of one province after another at the other, are we launching on a new career—the career of African conquest so kindly suggested by a Belgian publicist, who holds it out to us as a compensation for our Indian acquisitions, which, I think rightly, he considers as ultimately untenable. It is a pleasure to notice that outside of us there are signs of a recoil from this spirit of aggression, and that men who have a position which ensures attention have of late raised their voices against it. It is of little consequence whether their precise reasons agree or disagree with those we allege; their agreement with our conclusions is all that I am concerned with, and it is often the more useful by virtue of its amount of dissent.

Statesmen are hampered by their past, and by the consideration of the public which they address. We, to whom the voice of the public is of very little moment, may use and value their aid, but for ourselves we must hold another language. Never should we hesitate to condemn as essentially of a low order that which is called an imperial policy, the false glitter of which dazzles and misleads most of our contemporaries. It is out of date historically; for conquest loses all justification when there is no danger to those who undertake it, and no prospect of any real amalgamation between them and the

conquered. It is unjustifiable morally; for it is undertaken solely in our own interests, and for our own glorification, in contempt of all the just claims of others to their independence and the wholesome growth contingent on such independence. And more, it is unjustifiable morally, because it is easy to see, when once we fairly examine the question, that there is a nobler way open to us, and it is the part of baseness to choose the lower before the higher. Were it not, I would ask, far more imperial, far more in the spirit of the true imperial types, the greater Roman emperors, the Cæsars, the Trajans, and the Antonines, to look around us, and, recognising both our wrong-doing and its evil consequences, to set ourselves to repair them where it is yet possible; with the conscious dignity of an unconstrained choice to choose deliberately the onerous task of revision of our various acquisitions, and see what duties they had entailed upon us, as a reparation for the mode in which they were acquired, or for our long retention of them; pay off some of our debt to mercy and justice—all this with one principle as our guide, the admission of an equality of claims on the part of others to the exclusion of any fancied superiority on our own part? Were it not, again, far more imperial, whilst refusing any addition on whatever pretext, any addition that was virtually an incorporation—a protectorate is a different thing—to bring all the weight of our material, intellectual, and moral, advance to bear on the encouragement of the self-development of the less advanced—alone or in concert with others to protect them from aggression from whatever quarter, and most notably from the dangerous filibusters whom we ourselves too often foster? I am anticipating, I know; but such a policy is sure to come, and its superiority in grandeur, as in difficulty, will demonstrate the feebleness of our existing conceptions.

These, in one sense, larger issues must not make us neglectful of more immediate considerations connected with home matters, though I can only select here and there one. What is called the Irish question is, I doubt not, slowly ripening towards its only true, ultimate, satisfactory, conclusion, the recognition for Ireland of her national existence in the strictest sense of the term, whatever the exact forms through which it may pass. The essential justice of the

demand is, so far as I can see, not clearer than its conduciveness, if wisely urged and granted, to the welfare of both parties to the controversy. Its prominence during the past year justifies its introduction here. Those who insisted on its prominence do not seem to me to have lost their time.

The long strike which is still pending in London, with its various incidents, is but one of many facts which show how far from any real settlement are the difficult relations between capital and labour. We have a similar incident in the, to many, unexpected revelations of the existence of even more intense disputes in North America, under very different and, to the common judgment, much more favourable, outward conditions. That those relations can ever be adjusted in any country of Western Europe till some new principle is introduced into the struggle, is to us here more than doubtful. The conduct of the present discussion, as it continues day by day before our eyes, however favourably it contrasts in some respects with earlier disputes of a like character, manifests how absolutely unattainable is agreement, if we can only appeal to the doctrines as yet invoked. The triumph of one side or other—that, of course, is attainable, but it will be the triumph of exhaustion, not of conviction, leaving bitterness behind, more than usual bitterness in this case, on account of the peculiar means resorted to, questionable on other grounds. I note here the tendency of those means to sour the feelings of our workmen against another nation of the West. Of the two parties, the naturally weaker, that of the labourer, would, I suppose, have most of our sympathy; it certainly has mine. Its claim seems on the ordinary view the juster, its object the higher, its general action the more social, less entirely dictated by considerations of personal advantage; again, from its position it is driven to mere resistance, whilst the other party, were it rightly guided, has more freedom to initiate a really wise policy in respect to labour. The weight of responsibility must rest most heavily on the capitalist class. On every ground they are called on to form a true judgment on such questions, the judgment of citizens, not that of mere producers intent on amassing wealth and that with great rapidity.

May we not hope that some among them will forestall the

dangers which threaten the industrial system, and by a careful examination of their position, and the duties it involves, arrive at some truer conception of both ; that they will learn to see what human industry is, and what are the respective parts assigned to its agents ; how incompatible with any right ordering of a purely industrial society, such as that to which we are indisputably tending, is the naked assertion of the personal immediate interests of each of the two concurring parties ; how imperatively necessary is a sense of the community of both in the operation and its result ; how imperatively necessary is the recognition of the social value and character of the workman and of the employer equally ? They cannot, surely, be altogether blind to their danger. A stronger social order may prevent such an outbreak as we have seen in the United States, but the valuable lesson taught by that outbreak can hardly have passed unheeded—the lesson of the deep discontent which is harboured against the existing abuse of capital, in consequence of its employment almost universally for the gratification of our most selfish personality. Capitalists are stewards of the wealth which society allows them to condense. This is the teaching of the system which they profess to believe ; it is the still more explicit teaching of the system which awaits their adhesion. Their system cites them as stewards before the judgment of God ; ours before that of man, the nearer, clearer, and stronger, as less open to evasion. By one method or another they will be brought into conformity with this common teaching. It would be well for the Western world throughout its whole extent, well also indirectly for the rest of the world, if they would to some appreciable extent early conform themselves to it of their own free will. The due temperament of their function of production by that of government and the forethought it implies, this would give them a more noble as well as a more secure position.

But the sad truth is, that what they so much blame their men for is the case with themselves—perhaps in a higher degree, certainly with more persistency. They sacrifice their individual independence to their collective action. The single capitalist is as much under constraint as any trades unionist can be—rightly estimated, the pressure upon him is greater.

It is this which makes it so difficult to foresee any remedy for the evils which are patent to all observers—the evils arising from the direct action of the existing employers, always in tacit, if not avowed, combination. The courage needed to thwart the prejudices of such a class is a rare quality, as is the intellectual freedom which enables a man to rise above them. We have to look, at the best, to the slow influences of a well-directed opinion for any effectual remedy; at the worst, to the stronger impulse originating in terror. This is the prospect as at present. There remains the influence due to a reawakening of religious convictions, to the revival of some religious bond amongst men affecting their daily inter-relations, whatever the form such convictions or such bond may wear. Even the dominant theological faith is arousing itself, I allow with pleasure, to face this great difficulty.

I leave—they possess but little attraction for me—the manipulations of the suffrage. It is with an amused wonder that I see men of recognised ability apparently full of interest in them. I could wish that what has to be done in that direction were done as quickly as possible, and with the least talk; for such mechanical arrangements are a hindrance to objects of more importance. More worthy of attention are such faint signs as from time to time appear of a movement in favour of restoring or implanting some degree of life in our provincial centres. One sign of this was the recent application of some sixty towns for a better diffusion of the works of art which we possess. The raising of provincial life from its present depression is a really great object, and, so far as it is a recognition of it, the creation of new educational institutions, under whatever name, has a good in it. Unfortunately there will cleave to them all the curse of endowments and of a complicated official machinery, and, as at present constituted, their teaching will in all probability be a reproduction of the Babel which prevails at their predecessors, the older universities.

It is obvious to all that the important question of the disestablishment of the Church of England is rapidly becoming prominent—I at times fear too rapidly. For, if effected under present conditions and modes of thought,

there is no ground for hoping that it would be wisely effected, or with any degree of the vigour really required. It were to be wished that it could wait till the general opinion were fixed on the subject of endowments in the widest sense, alive, that is, to the advisability of getting rid of them in principle, whereas we are just now witnessing a most unwise extension of them. Nor is this the only ground for deprecating any hurry in the disestablishment. What is the system which is to replace the Church organisation? is a not unnatural question. We see its highest function assumed by the State even prior to its disappearance, and we see little reason to welcome the intruder. Time in no way lessens my objections to this school-board work of so-called education. In other directions, also, there may be ground for uneasiness, though in theory we accept the change in its due time as desirable, and are strong advocates for the voluntary system, and the equal footing on which it places all faiths.

It is the same with the growing disorganisation of religious belief, which we cannot but watch with mixed feelings. It is too rapid, if we ask ourselves what substitute there is; whilst, as the natural condition of the rise of another belief, we cannot altogether dislike it. Very remarkable and full of promise is the simultaneous growth of the religious sentiment, which clings to the decaying creeds in the absence of something better, but which has a true intrinsic value quite apart from these supports.

Without a word of complaint, without a word of satisfaction as to the general condition or prospects of the religious movement in which we are engaged, I turn henceforth to such thoughts as are more peculiarly appropriate to the Festival of Humanity which we celebrate by our present meeting. They will be found in close connection with those which I have expressed in the three previous addresses, published under one common title, that of Human Catholicism.

Such a term, if rightly estimated, opens to us wide fields of thought, and we may take one or other of them, as occasion serves, without much fear of exhausting its interest. It is meant, in relation to our religious movement, to place us at the very centre, at the point whence we may view most

conveniently all its varied aspects, and to indicate also its true character. I have chiefly dealt with it as bringing us face to face with the only other great organic movement with which we in this Western world have to do, the activity, the renewed life, of the mediæval faith and Church, of Roman Catholicism, that so we may elicit the lessons such a contrast suggests. Naturally, it is the Church and not the Faith which most occupies our attention, as constituting essentially the stronger obstacle. I think I may say with truth that it is in no spirit of controversial animosity that I have at any time handled this subject, but rather in reverent acceptance of the noble past of the institution which it is my wish not so much to criticise as to study; in due admiration of the courage and dignity with which the Church of Rome meets the dangers to which she knows herself exposed; even more, in fullest sympathy with her in principle in her present struggle against the encroachments on all true spiritual action and liberty attempted by the formidable power of the modern State, as it exists in most countries of Western Europe, under whatever specious appearance such encroachments may be veiled. Yet, on the other hand, we must not shrink—I have not shrunk—from examining closely her claims, and from exposing their weakness, much less from endeavouring, with as much force as I can, to set forth the superior claims and promise of the new Church which is slowly rising to confront her, the Church of Humanity.

This general statement indicates the course which I intend to pursue to-day. More or less explicitly, there runs through the whole a reference to Roman Catholicism, a comparison of the two Churches, and of the ideas which underlie each, of the degree of power which each has to justify its assertion of Catholicity, the ultimate test by which each will have to stand or fall; lastly, of the methods which each adopts in such assertion, whether different or common.

One most definite advantage of the Religion of Humanity, I said, in its superior continuity; as the necessary defectiveness in regard to this idea is the weakest point in its competitor. It was necessary that Roman Catholicism should break with the previous religions, necessary by virtue of its antecedents, and as a consequence of the monotheistic idea

on which it was raised. One alone of its predecessors could be exempted from the summary general rejection, and its partial adoption of that one implied its turning from the rest, whilst no such partial adoption could prevent a breach with that which it partially adopted. This is seen most clearly if we leave the mediæval Catholicism, as it existed in its vigour and as it still exists in its decay, and direct our attention to its beginnings, see how it presented itself to its real founder, St. Paul. His birth and training had imbued him deeply with the tradition, the spirit, and the hopes, of his nation, as it looked forward to the dawn of a brighter era, a period of triumph and of glory. We know his zeal in this national cause, his vehement rejection of another interpretation of the promises to the chosen people, his aversion to the new way which was to supersede the law of Moses. We can follow him in the crisis of his belief, in the strong disturbance the change wrought, in the period of retirement during which he meditated the consequences of such change. When after that preparation he came forward as the preacher of the new religion, the conception he had formed of it was, we see, different from that which had been formed by its earlier adherents. He was in a degree even in opposition to them. They clung, and we have no evidence to show that to their latest day they ceased to cling, to a literal continuity between Christianity and Judaism, the former being to them but a more spiritual version of the latter; and we know how much there is to justify their view in the language attributed to Jesus of Nazareth in the earlier Gospels, which may be considered as its expression. There was much too in the nature of things. Men instinctively hold on to the past, and to the most literal, most definite, best known, representation of the past. They are slow to move out of their familiar ideas into a new sphere, which may be keeping those ideas in substance and value whilst it enlarges them, but which seems to be destroying them as it attacks their outward, more perishable, form. This is so where no divine sanction is claimed for the ideas which are being abandoned. How much more must it have been so to the Jew, with all the imposing associations of his law, with the history of his nation before him, and with the language of the prophets stirring in his mind!

Feeling in common with others this want of man's nature, the imperious need of some continuity, but feeling also the want of a faith which should be universal, and in which, therefore, all existing distinctions must merge, Judaism not excepted, St. Paul saw that there lay in the records of his nation another tradition older and more serviceable than that of Moses. The tradition of Abraham's faith was prior to that of the law given on Sinai. With that it was possible to enlarge the visible into the invisible, the temporal into the spiritual Israel, and to construct a continuous society into which all the nations of mankind might enter without any national or local prescriptions interfering—a society which should inherit all the promises, all the glorious visions hitherto limited to the earthly Israel and finding in it no adequate recipient.

Nor does this represent justly in its full extent the amount of St. Paul's divergence from his original belief. Under the dominion of his time and education, as of his national feeling, he might like to connect the fortunes of the Christian Church with those of the Jewish people, but in the full catholicity of his aspirations we can see that in his own way, and in the only form in which such an idea was open to him, he sought, not merely for the unity of man in the future, but for his continuity throughout the past. The declaration of human unity throughout the whole of human existence, which we find in the speech at Athens, is in keeping with the peculiarity in the Pauline gospel of tracing the genealogy of Jesus beyond Abraham to Adam as the common progenitor of all men, and is still more in keeping with the language of the Apostle in his Epistles, where he draws the parallel between the first and the last Adam, each in equal degree the representative, though under different aspects, of all men without exception. That is to say, that all who had borne the image of the first were fitted to bear the image of the second—as the fall had been co-extensive with humanity, so must the rising again be—there could be no special limit to the restoration, as there had been none to the decay. In a sense such a doctrine is, it must be allowed, an assertion of human continuity, as it is the concluding of all men, without distinction of time and place, under one

sentence, and under one hope ; and as such it is worthy of the great Christian Apostle.

But whilst we allow this, we must not be blind to the difficulties which beset the construction of St. Paul—difficulties which it was impossible for him to avoid or surmount with the materials he had, at that period of man's history ; difficulties which were a fatal bar to the establishment of any real continuity of feeling or action, any continuity of man within the limits of Humanity. As through one man all had fallen, so through one man all must be restored ; the Christ must answer to the Adam of the Hebrew Scriptures, which to St. Paul were the oracles of God. And that he might do so, if of the seed of David according to the flesh, he must be the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness ; the crucified Jesus must be more than man, if by virtue of his crucifixion he was to be the Redeemer of mankind. But herein lay the stumbling-block to the Jew, and the Apostle of the new faith had to turn from the Jew as an opponent whom he had no hope of converting. What an effort this cost him we may easily see ; he has left us the expression of his regret, his earnest desire that it might be otherwise, his longing, his conviction that at some time, in some unexplained way, it would be otherwise, and that the change would be a signal benefit to the faith he preached.

We know that the breach has not been healed, that the hope of the Apostle remains unfulfilled, that the Christ of St. Paul has not been accepted, is not likely to be accepted, by the Jews. He is still a stumbling-block and a cause of separation to them. The wisdom of the Greeks gradually yielded to the doctrine of the crucified Jesus and bent its latest efforts to its careful elaboration ; to them it ceased to be foolishness. But the Jew has stood aloof. And as under the logical handling of the Greek world, and the necessities of the social condition of mankind, the language which had so angered the disciples of a pure monotheism,—the believers in the divine Unity, a faith so burnt into their souls by their suffering—became more and more distinct, and the human element in the conception of the Christ gradually passed out of sight, or the claim of co-equal and co-eternal Godhead was more prominently put forward as inseparable from it,

the offence became greater to them, their acceptance more hopeless, and the hostility between them and the believers in Christianity more irreconcilable. Their firm, if passive, resistance remained insurmountable, and mediæval Catholicism turned with abhorrence from the nation whose God it recognised, in whose documents it saw the necessary foundations of its own faith, on whose past history and aspirations it had to fall back for the justification of all its pretensions.

As time passes on, and the belief of the nations which have long accepted the Christian faith becomes, under many combined influences, essentially modified, the truth tends to make itself felt that there was real ground for the opposition both of Jew and Greek; that the cultivated intellect and the religious convictions of those to whom it was offered had a certain justification for rejecting that which St. Paul offered, as being only a partial, unsatisfactory remedy, whereas it professed to be conclusive and of universal application. If the Jew failed to attain to more than the attitude of resistance, the true heir of the Jewish Monotheism, Islam, triumphed largely over Greek Christianity, thus disproving its universality. And the inheritors of Greek thought and science are avenging the temporary defeat of both by the gradual yet complete subversion of the doctrines to which they succumbed, thus disproving its conclusiveness. If then we say broadly that the Greeks were right and the Jews were right, we must infer that the triumph of St. Paul was due to the fact that his conception, and the church which grew out of it, were a satisfaction to a social want, and as such overbore all opposition. The demand from the world with which St. Paul was in contact was for something which might bind men together, and no intellectual weakness in the bond which he put forward in answer to that demand could interfere with its acceptance. Nor, if we may apply the experience of the past to the future, will any such intellectual weakness interfere with the continuance of such acceptance till a true substitute be found, or at least one as adapted to the necessities of the generations which are coming as St. Paul's was to the early ages of the Church which he founded.

In the history of Catholicism, Roman Catholicism, we may trace the gradual withdrawal of the personal type,

preached by St. Paul, from its close connection with man, and its consequent supersession by types of a more human interest. The God triumphed over the man in the union of the two, but became thereby more alien to man, and was replaced. Where this process has not gone on, or where there has been a reaction from it, as in Northern and Protestant Europe, the course of human thought and devotion has been rather towards the getting rid of the Divine element and exalting the human at its expense.

This has been eminently the case in a certain school in our own country, which clings with tenacity to the human aspect of the Christ. We are all familiar with their language, with their confident assumption that, so regarded, the type offers all that man can want as a religious being. No difficulties are allowed to stand in their way; by some device or other, logical or illogical, all are declared to be overcome.

I will enter into no direct criticism of the Christian type in reference to the many objections of various kinds which beset it. In my judgment the time is not yet come for the proper adjustment of our view of it, or, at any rate, for the detailed exposition of such adjustment. I will even here allow the beauty and value of this type as a continuous creation of Humanity. Placing ourselves in sympathy with the generations of our forefathers, so far as they have been members of the Church of Christ, we may, if we do not share their faith, acknowledge the large amount of justification which it had, and the great benefits which no imperfection in that faith prevented their deriving from it. Again, we are not called on, in the case of those of our own generation who sincerely cling to this type, to impugn its usefulness. We might desire of them greater clearness as to the light in which they would have us view it, a greater distinctness in its presentation, more definiteness as to the grounds on which they rest its claims. As at present, they seem to shift those claims in the most confusing manner, producing, on the whole, a painful impression.

But whilst recognising the value of the type of the Christ, I recur to what I said above. It is a continuous creation of human thought. The uncertain outline of a given person-

ality has, by succeeding generations of saints and thinkers, been filled in with all that the rising conceptions of purity and holiness could contribute. It has grown therefore in beauty with the moral growth of the believers in it. And the process is retro-active also. Whatever there is in the earlier mode of viewing it which dis-suits their purpose is rejected as incongruous, or explained away by later devotion, so that the original in both ways fades more completely into mist, and the subjective creation is paramount to the exclusion of all fact and history. So strong has been this impulse in its favour, that it is endowed with an absorptive power over much that can be distinctly proved not to belong to it, as, for instance, the gradual but most valuable acquisitions of pre-Christian morality, whether Jewish or Gentile. As such an embodiment of the aspirations of the race it is however of great value, to us even who set it aside.

But when all allowance has been made for the past and still extant belief in this personal type as the glorification of Humanity, it remains open to the fatal objection that its influence is limited and exclusive. It is valid for the Western world, not for man. As the Jews rejected it at its origin, as Mohammed rejected it, though with a partial recognition, so under whichever of its two aspects it is put forward it is unacceptable to the believers in the other religions, those which lie outside these two pure monotheisms, as they are outside the Christianity of which these two are the complement. As the experience of the world grows larger, this is found to be the case on an extended scale, and there are Christian teachers who are not blind to this increase of their difficulties. Most especially is this true if we take the refined humanitarianism of recent theology as what is to be preached. On what ground can the type it offers expect to supersede the ancient beliefs of the Eastern world, Brahminical, Buddhist, or that of Confucius? Its attitude towards them is of necessity condemnatory, but on what plea, if the older notion of the redemption be set aside, and a mere model of human goodness be all that is proposed? Such a conception is wholly irrelevant where there already exist models which satisfy the aspirations of men. It is different when we

have to deal with tribes at a less advanced stage of civilisation, who have, as it were, no past to go back upon, no ideal, real or subjective, to which they can look up. There some results may be attained in the name of the Christian type; but most of what is sound in those results is due to the civilising influences of which it is the accompaniment, rather than to itself. The strictly religious influence is almost invariably extremely superficial, where it is not worse. The arts and appliances of sedentary life, if wisely introduced, have their value; but their utility is as often impaired as heightened by their connection with the peculiar belief in whose name they are introduced. All the benefits conferred would have a surer foundation if they were given on strictly human grounds, whilst the effort of the intellect to grasp alien ideas, and the danger to the moral nature of a mere verbal assent, so easily passing into a hypocritical acceptance, would both be avoided. Be this as it may, the case of such backward populations is hardly an objection to the statement above made that the type on which Western Christendom reposes nominally its faith is in application limited to the social conditions out of which it grew.

If this is so, we see how impossible it is to harmonise this Western creed with any real continuity of the race. Turn where you will almost, and you will find its pretensions unrecognised, itself an obstacle. It must condemn the past of all those to whom it is offered, and by doing so it remains a fatal obstacle to their union in the future.

None of these objections apply to the Religion of Humanity and the collective type in which it is condensed. There is no idea connected with it of fall or redemption, of sentence or pardon, nor any rejection of former ideals, but the allowance in their degree of all. Hence its power to conciliate and comprehend all. For an instance I return to the special case with which I began, that of the Jew. The disciples of the new religion, appealing to the Jew, ask not from him any condemnation of his national past, but rather offer him its full recognition, as also an explanation of, and an atonement for, all the wrong which his nation has suffered for its adherence to that past. Before the Son of Man in the Christian sense we see that he could

never bow; but in the Son of Man in the collective sense we think he might recognise the fulfilment of the more glowing language of his ancient prophecies. Those prophecies have been applied with more or less success to a particular person—not unfrequently have the incidents of that person's life been warped to suit them; but in their primary natural sense even the most evangelical of these predictions were meant for Judah or Israel as a people, whose depression was to the seer a vicarious suffering; and their fullest, worthiest, most consistent application would consequently be to the collective human past which stands to the whole of the race in the same relation as the kingdom of Judah stood to it in the vision of Isaiah. Surely in the past Humanity hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows. And again referring to what has been said above, the anticipation of St. Paul might find its realisation. The people that dwelt alone, that was not numbered among the nations in older times, and which, to the Apostle's grief, would not enter the communion of the spiritual Israel, may not be the last to recognise that the time for its isolation to cease has come, that the fulness of the Gentiles is at hand, and may more than it has ever yet done acknowledge its human brotherhood—feel that its Messianic aspirations find an adequate accomplishment in the advent of Humanity. It would be a fulfilment in spirit of St. Paul's prayer, a literal fulfilment of his language, that the fulness of them would be the riches of the Gentiles. 'If the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall be the receiving but life from the dead?'

And as with the Jews, so with the other extra-Christian religions, we offer no obstacle to their integration into the universal religion by any condemnation of their past, or by any unwise pressure on them hastily to renounce it. They need not burn what they have adored. They need but awake to a consciousness of its incompleteness, and pass with a sense of enlargement into the completer whole.

Such considerations on the general superiority of the collective type over the personal—of Humanity as an object of worship over Christ—may suffice for an introduction to some practical points connected with the setting

forth of either on which I wish to touch. It is generally felt amongst us, that the preaching of Humanity is a much more difficult matter than was the preaching of Christ. No doubt there is some truth in this feeling: there is more difficulty, both being equally subjective, in grasping the collective ideal, though this is most true when it comes as a substitute for a personal, not, as it will be to our successors, a primary association, familiar to the lisplings of infancy. Yet I am inclined to think we greatly overrate this difficulty, and that the acceptance of the type we proclaim will be much easier than we venture to dream. We are apt to forget the preparation, both positive and negative, the training of our powers of conception by a long familiarity with an unseen ideal, the loosening of the hold of that ideal upon us, partly by its own intrinsic weakness, partly by the gradual enlargement of our demands upon it as our horizon has widened and other religions have come within our range of knowledge and thought; when it is no longer the Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics of the beautiful collect of the English Church which are to be brought into the flock to become one fold under one Shepherd, but vast communities hardly thought of by the framers of that collect. Again, there has been the powerful agency of the Roman Catholic Church, or if you like, of the Christian Church, in familiarising all Western minds with the idea of a collective existence to which allegiance was due, though it was largely composed of those whose life on earth was over, the Church triumphant, the white rose of Dante, being with the Church militant an essential portion of the communion of saints. Add the stimulating effect of the increasing contact of the several nations with one another, an effect which is felt in manifold ways at once. Take in also the preparation by thinkers, whether poets, philosophers, or historians, for the reception of this idea, the growing sense which they have spread around them of there being a real unity of man. Lastly, look at the rapid acceptance of the term Humanity, as a real being, within our own observation, a vague acceptance too often if you will, but still an acceptance. And its use is great; for it exempts us from the difficulty inherent in a first statement or introduction of the term—from any novelty of announcement.

There is laid in most minds a certain basis for further argument or thought, a germ susceptible of development; and if, as we believe, the real meaning of the term is of the highest value, this apparently superficial beginning, this first step, is a substantial advance. That it is felt to be so may be seen by the unconcealed repugnance to the term in question of all those who, whilst understanding its full significance, are logically and consistently hostile to it.

I have spoken on other occasions of the hindrances thrown in our way by the disturbance of all the peaceful relations of the West—not to go farther at present—and contrasted our state with that of the unity of the Roman Empire. Yet there is a compensation even here. The deeper want is peace; and all that is going on is, under all this disturbance, awakening to more life the conviction that something not as yet found, or not acknowledged, is needed to ensure the satisfaction of that want, should be, perhaps is, arousing more energy in the providing such satisfaction. It was a moral craving that led to the acceptance of Christianity, it will be a moral craving that will lead to the acceptance of its successor—such acceptance as will ensure it the full opportunity for putting out all its powers. If those powers be found wanting on trial, the new religion will fail, as the older one has failed, and another effort will be required to find one that will better answer to the demands of mankind. Meanwhile, those who trust in it have to labour for its spread, unchecked by any ulterior possibility of failure. No final absorption of his noble work into a different construction can make us regard St. Paul's high devotion as lost to the world. We are unceasing in our assertion of the contrary. There are none of those who adhere to its results in their more direct form who pay a more reflecting, more sincere homage than we do. So, conceivably, may it be for those who, as we, are engaged in propagating this later embodiment of the Christian aspirations. The particular form may pass, the essential service remain. In any case we can but submit to the conditions and wants of the present hour.

So much by the way. I incline to the belief that something of the slowness which attaches to our advance, or to the growth of the Religion of Humanity, would disappear if

we had a sufficient conviction of the propriety of its direct preaching; if we were convinced, that is, that it can be taken without so much previous preparation as some language that I see implies to be necessary; if we were convinced that equally amongst those who have set aside the older faith, as amongst those who still acknowledge it, there are numbers who would be little disposed to look too closely into the intellectual basis of our Religion, when they have a strong disposition to accept it on grounds of sentiment, as satisfactory, that is, to their truer human feelings; that such will pass from doubt or belief, as the case may be, at once into the new faith, and will learn by experience whether it meets their want or no.

See what men do accept all around us under the impulse of the religious sentiment, and under the need of communion in life and action. No unreality, no deficiency in point of reason, deters them. And when they have accepted, see with what self-sacrifice they are prepared to devote themselves. Or turn back on our own experience, in ourselves or in those more immediately connected with us, where we could watch the process. I cannot think that such experience will tell us that it was through full intellectual satisfaction that we or they adopted the religion we believe. That comes later, is a consequent of our belief, and of the study or meditation to which it leads us. We grow into the faith through the power of the idea.

It is, in fact, true for us, as for those before us, that it is with the heart man believeth to understanding, and this truth finds its due recognition in the method of propounding our religion left us by our Master. The Catechism concentrates the attention at once on the central conception, the Being whom we worship—such is the object of the introduction. Then, before the doctrine, comes the full explanation of the worship, as the preliminary to the condition of the right appreciation of the doctrine. The appeal, that is to say, is made in the first place to the feeling of man, and it is as the indispensable support of that feeling that we pass on to his intellectual cultivation. It is the same with our system of education, in the proper sense of the term. The great stress there, again, is laid on the culture of the feelings by every

available means, and on the early creation, as their best field and truest discipline, of some simple worship, worship of the representatives of Humanity at the outset, but quickly introducing the child to the power they represent. Again, the cultus precedes the teaching. It is with the belief of the heart that the child of Humanity sets out on his course of higher intellectual culture, and through such belief is enabled to meet its dangers.

I have little doubt that in proportion as we act on this principle, in proportion, that is, to our direct preaching of Humanity as the true object of men's love and service, will be our success; and that we, or those who shall come immediately after us, are unprepared for the amount of that success. It may indeed be found true that, in a period when the apostolate is the most urgent need, we shall gather in good fruit of our apostleship in proportion as we fall back on the great apostolic exemplar, and with the necessary transformation of his words, which you will effect for yourselves, follow St. Paul in his practice, determined to know nothing save Jesus Christ and Him crucified.

That the period is one for the apostolate, not exclusively—we cannot neglect any aspect of our organic effort—but most urgently, can hardly be disputed. What, in few words, is our most pressing, most immediate want? It is the formation of a sufficiently numerous body of believers to be a solid basis for our further action. We want numbers, and we must get them from the adult world which surrounds us. It is a process of adult conversion in which we are primarily engaged, and each believer may promote it. The training of the young who have been born in the faith of Humanity, or who have come to it at a very early age, under the influence of their parents, is a work of high importance; but there are but few of them, and we want to multiply the parents who bring the young. You must have learners, if you are to teach. It is the growth of a congregation of faithful men, of a church union, with all the benefits that such union can give, which must precede all other aims. It is the slow rate of growth of this union that most retards adhesion to us. In many minds there is a misgiving that we are destined to succeed in our objects, to set aside the other competing

institutions. Such minds watch our progress, or at any rate our proceedings; but not being able to register much advance, they hold aloof and feel justified in the attitude of scepticism as to the efficacy of our system. In short, none of our aims can be attained till this necessary condition be fulfilled, and it is one for the fulfilment of which we must wait long, if it be indeed true that a long systematic training is indispensable for the reception of our religion.

Supposing numbers to join us, of course there will be difficulties. They will bring much of their old associations with them; they will long have an imperfect mastery of that which they accept; there will be the liability to frequent withdrawals, to an abandonment of the task undertaken. There will be, in a word, all the incidents which attend on an infant society, and which are too apt to continue after the period of infancy. For all we must be prepared. Let us but have the numbers, and we will take patiently the evils which accompany them. No doctrine has failed to overcome those evils, least of all our immediate predecessor, which had them in large store. Examine the history of the mediæval Catholicism at its origin, and you will allow that we need hardly expect to have greater embarrassments of all sorts to contend with, external and internal; no obstacle that the hostility or perverse ingenuity of man could throw in its way will be found wanting in its records.

If it be allowed that this formation of a body of believers is our prime want, we must examine carefully what are the means we use to supply it, exert ourselves to throw no hindrance in the way of its supply, rather facilitate in every possible manner the access to our religion. I will content myself with but a mention of that which is the capital point, the fashioning ourselves and our lives so that we become centres of contagious influence—an influence often unknown to ourselves, and hardly the subject of consciousness to others—but not the less real. I commend that part of the subject to your own thoughts, reminding those who need the reminder that such an influence can never wisely be our direct object but must be the indirect outcome of our growth in goodness. On this occasion my thoughts lead me rather to the method of our teaching, to the importance of condensing it as much

as possible, in so far as we look at it as a converting agency, giving it all the simplicity and power which attend on the more concrete, synthetic presentation of one great central idea, and trusting to that idea to vivify those who receive it.

A religion such as ours makes, and will always make, great demands on the intellectual activity of its disciples, as well as on their practical energy. The former, we know, is not prone to continued exertion. Even with all its acquired power, and its constant stimulation by the exaggerated idea which prevails of its value, we know how ready the intellect is to flag and desist from any long strain. It wants the steady application of a sufficient motive. Such motive can only be given, as a religious question, by the sway exercised over us by an already accepted belief—I speak of the immense majority, of course—a belief which inculcates as a duty the laborious cultivation of our mental powers as ministering to our moral existence, and enabling us to be worthier servants of the power in which it teaches us to believe. This motive supplied, we may expect those who in adult age have gained it to be strongly influenced by it in the direction of expansion of their whole nature, with no exception, most certainly, of their intellectual nature. The danger lies quite the other way. Few, I think, who look closely into the subject will deny that the danger does lie the other way, that whether it be in the acquiring of new adherents or our self-guidance after adhesion, there is traceable an overvalue of the intellectual element, an undue forgetfulness of the truth that intellect by itself is not a motor power, a tendency to rest in the intellectual satisfactions of our Religion without bestirring ourselves to propagate it.

Our primary object therefore must be to awaken, or encourage, if awakened, the impulse to a new religion, and for this purpose to set forth in its unity the being which is its central point, the acceptance of which is fundamental. And by far the best method in the beginning is the oral and personal communication of our belief, not insistent, but as much as possible limited to thoughtful suggestions and to the helping thought in the person's mind whom we are addressing, watching for opportunities rather than anxiously creating them. It is the inward, natural growth that we

wish to promote. The more there can be of this process before there is any question of books the better. Even when some amount of reading has become inevitable, when the intellect must be called in, all possible care must be taken that it be not impeded in its clear apprehension of the central truth by overlaying it with much study. Hence I am inclined to think the most valuable assistance is given us in the tables which hang on our walls, which are eminently suggestive, provocative of thought, rather than dictative of its precise form in detail. Their educational value, independently of our religion, so far as they can be independent of it, is great, and in connection with it their full use has not as yet been realised, especially as regards its propagation. They are short, in essentials easily remembered, and supply constant material for the mind's active power, as well as food for conversation with others. And it is to draw out the active power of the mind, its faculty of meditation, that we should direct our effort. What we so make our own is a true possession.

It may not be out of place here, if to illustrate my meaning I make a few remarks on the latest addition to those tables—the table of the first, the prime philosophy, especially in reference to its principal constituent—that known as the fifteen laws—which intervene between the theory of abstraction and the abstract and concrete hierarchies. Whatever the value, and it is undeniably great, of their systematic, philosophic exposition, it is from another point of view that I wish to consider them, as parts, that is, of the universal education of the intellect. As such the teaching them is placed at the very opening of the course of philosophic instruction. It is addressed, therefore, to very young people, and yet it is the teaching of the widest generalisations. They must, if addressed to the very young, be appreciable by them, but they can hardly be so in their full sense. Their general scope and the meaning of each may, however, be so placed within their reach, that they may take them with them in all their subsequent training, gradually growing into a more just apprehension of their value. Their minds will work on them by the habit of applying them on all suitable occasions, and such occasions

are constantly arising, and so they will become an inseparable part of their mental constitution, a fence against all intellectual deviations. But it is the work of each pupil's own mind that we especially wish to call out by this process, the continuous effort of self-appropriation; not, of course, for itself as an end, but as conferring on him the power of wisely using that which by such effort he has appropriated. The universal value will reside then in the shorter form, the condensed statement, understood, committed to memory, and, if I may use the expression, thought up to,—the philosophic exposition will be for the teacher and thinker.

So it is with the other tables which have been framed in the same spirit—in the highest degree with the Calendar which offers such powerful assistance in regard to the conception of Humanity. They are meant to concentrate and direct thought, not to take its place. They will lead, no doubt, to a desire for further information on the system they condense, to a certain amount of direct study of it as a whole. But if that study be undertaken in order to gain a more thorough knowledge of the religion as a basis of action, not as an object of speculative inquiry, it will be important to avoid all superfluous intellectual strain, as tending to confusion, not clearness or vigour of thought, to an unprofitable use of our time and faculties.

We have none of us, perhaps, in this connection, sufficiently present to our minds the pregnant expression of our master when he spoke of the *noxious habit of reading*—so compressive of thought.

We have incurred a certain danger in this respect by the translation of the *Politique Positive*, not, I hope counterbalancing its advantages, but a real inconvenience. It is a work which requires a great amount of leisure and effort, and I may add of previous training, if it is to be duly mastered; and such conditions are not generally fulfilled. It is by its present form thrown open to all, and we may be sure that most will not study it, but pick out here and there bits which please them or which they dislike. But I am now thinking more of the serious religious inquirer, and of the desirability of his reading the work. To such I would strongly counsel abstention as a general rule, per-

sistent abstention to most; the deliberate concentration of your energies on the work which contains the condensed expression of the larger one, so far as that is strictly a religious work; on the Catechism, which affords ample matter for meditation, full guidance for your religious thought, and most definite direction for the highest sphere of that thought, the worship of Humanity, in all its fulness. You will spare yourselves (I speak to the really religious student) much time and labour, for which you have need enough in other directions, most particularly in the study of the great poets or other religious books, and you will have gained a much truer mastery of that which is to be your life. If after that you are in a position to enter on the study of the great work in its entirety, you will not regret that you have laid such a foundation for your undertaking; and, as you proceed, you will, if I mistake not, see the truth of some such judgment as that which I have been expressing, as there gradually becomes clear to you what a masterly, adequate condensation its author has provided, so far, I repeat, as the properly religious construction is concerned. In this reading age, however, I have no doubt that such advice as is here given will be generally set aside, and as little doubt that in very many cases the issue will be the abandonment of all interest or further inquiry.

I am not unmindful in all this of the claim of our system to form in an eminent degree true citizens, men of great practical energy, fitted to meet all the requirements of our difficult and shifting social existence. It is rather because I wish to see such claims justified that I advocate the method I have been advocating. Where but in religious convictions first duly formed will you get the strength and persistence so generally wanting, so indispensably requisite for firm, wise, action? Where, again, but from the same source will you get the clear perception of the aim of such action, which is needed for its right direction? Once form your servants of Humanity, give them a living faith in her, and I have no fear but they will act—act as Cromwell's soldiers acted—so that they were never beaten. At the present time, I am as ready as any to allow it, as much as at any time, the political and social world call for and lend themselves to a wise inter-

vention, and there are occasions on which we can in a degree intervene, but the result will almost always be found to bear a definite relation to the measure of religious force which is exerted in attaining it; in other words, men will be influenced by the advice we give or the conduct we adopt, in proportion as they perceive that advice and conduct to have behind them some higher, more comprehensive, some religious doctrine from which they spring. Examine such efforts as have been made, and such attention as they have secured, and you will, I think, find that it is because the efforts have been recognised as parts of a larger scheme, as connected and not isolated efforts, that they have excited attention. And the more thoughtful and worthier of our observers or opponents are not slow to acknowledge that in the fact that the larger scheme is a religion lies both the justification for our action and its claim upon their consideration.

Nor, again, am I unmindful of the high intellectual claims of our system, and of the desirability of its showing its competence to deal with all the mental problems which are under discussion, still less of the desirability of its showing its competence to train aright the intellects of its disciples, whether the adult or the minor. It is a simple question of precedence, and I claim precedence, to the fullest extent, for the religious idea, for the faith of Humanity, in the intellectual even more, if possible, than in the active world, the danger being the greater in the former. It is the revolt of the intellect which we come forward to quell, and in our religion alone can we find the strength for such a task. When that is not accepted, or accepted merely in some vague way, in its most general principle, as men say, but without its being in any real sense a faith, much less as a cultus or religious ordering of our feelings and life, then it is not to be expected that the existing revolutionary disorder in the sphere of intellectual inquiry will be looked on with disfavour, or be treated as other than a desirable state, fostering the free development of discussion and mental activity, both alike purposeless and without limit. Where the religion is accepted in the manner above defined, there is a certainty of mental advance becoming an object in the acceptor, to the extent in which his powers and previous attainments place it within

his reach. What ceases is not the desire for intellectual growth—for himself and others he feels its value too keenly—but the disorderly growth. He learns to take a just measure of his mental wants, and to see what direction they most wisely take. We need have no fear that a human religion such as ours will not meet all the just demands of the human intellect; but it will claim, and vindicate its claim, to say what are its just demands.

Turn the matter whichever way we will, and we shall, I think, see ground for the conclusion that in the extension of our religion the worship precedes the doctrine; 'the final step condensing the whole of my religious development.' Such is Comte's language (*Pol. Pos.*, vol. iv., p. 476, E. Tr.). And I do not seek to limit the term extension, but apply it equally to the succession of generations as to the conversion of those outside us in our own or other times; to the bringing of the young into the Church, as to the bringing of the adult. And if the conclusion is admitted, it must affect our whole method of proceeding. We may not shrink from acting fearlessly upon it.

Wheresoever men meet, there this work of extension may be carried on—in an infinite variety of ways, doubtless, the particular way being a matter for each one concerned, but in some way or other; as often as not by a silent impression conveyed from the believer to those with whom he is in contact, without any direct urging, but not unfrequently by some word betraying a different judgment, or different principles of judgment, from those generally accepted; or again throwing light on some question which was previously obscure. Each year makes the work easier, because each year the number increases of those who have had some vague intimation that there is a new Religion proclaimed, and are as a soil prepared for its germs to take root in them. In the most unexpected quarters you may find some knowledge of what we offer, and a disposition to connect what are apparently chance utterances with it.

Slow as our progress has been, and is, the period of real pressure, a pressure verging on discouragement, seems to me near its end, if not ended, if only we have the faith to take it so. In ourselves alone can there be any solid ground for

discouragement ; all other difficulties are comparatively light. Think what it is to have secured, in the extent to which it has been secured, the recognition that there is a Religion of Humanity, with sufficient motive power in it to modify belief and to prompt to consistent action. It is the most difficult step of all, and that it has been taken is a convincing proof, if we look to the time spent over it and to the state of the social environment in which it has been taken, of the readiness of the Western world for our religion. From such a beginning we have but to move forward in all confidence, not troubling ourselves with measuring our expectations—expectation and disappointment going hand in hand—but sure of ultimate and, relatively speaking, not distant success. It should be of little account whether we see it or not, whether we are satisfied or not with the travail of our soul. We sow for others, as we have reaped the labour of others.

The full assurance of faith, such should be our aim, and we can get it but through love—such is the teaching we have received—the love of Humanity. And such love must be fed, as it must begin, by the contemplation of the loved object, by pressing into her presence, living in communion with her. We too, not less than those who have gone before us, must raise our eyes to gaze on the eternal brightness, must crave for the beatific vision. But armed with a faith so gained we may go on our way rejoicing, as more than conquerors. We may be sure that we shall impart to others of that which we have freely received ; we cannot fail to do so ; it goes out from us to others. Never has great faith been known to fail. Where it has rested on insecure foundations, we know what its triumphs have been ; what should they be where the foundations are unassailable, as we feel and may convince ourselves that ours are ? If the theistic beliefs around us are evidently yielding to a process of decay, it is because that on which they are built gives way under pressure ; they cannot meet the searching spirit of doubt. Apply the same pressure as is brought to bear on them to the conception of Humanity ; let the same men apply it, so that the power of thought exerted is the same in both cases. The experiment is going on daily before our eyes, and am I not warranted in saying that the result is a consciousness of

success, complete success in reference to the central idea of theology, it is felt to give way under pressure; the absence of such consciousness of success in reference to the central idea of our human Religion, it strengthens under pressure. Men may turn from this central idea in dislike, whereas there is a certain attitude of respectful sympathy towards the other, whatever the motive for such attitude; but they are often driven in word to admit it, free to reject every consequence of such admission.

Strong therefore in faith, in both senses of the word—intellectual belief and moral confidence—preach we boldly and simply, by all available methods, the Being in whom we believe, Humanity—preach we our Religion, and not a scientific system; that will be amply cared for. It is the shortest and the surest way to arrive at our destination, which, as I have ever said, is the foundation of a church. To this let all else be subordinate; from this let all else emanate; this is worth striving for, and I know not that anything else is.

Much of what I have said it has been an effort to me to say. I have never shrunk from ridicule but I do not court it, and there are possibly some here to whom my utterances may sound strange and ridiculous, and there are others, and perhaps even some of those who share my general convictions, to whom they may be neither one nor the other, but to whom, in part, they may be distasteful. Throughout my work, as a preacher of a new religion, it has been a source of discomfort, has this partial disagreement; the greater or less aversion, but still some aversion, to the predominantly religious character which I have endeavoured to impress upon our, in some degree, common movement; as it has been the source of satisfaction to see in some cases such aversion lessen or become transformed into assent. In our actual world its continuance must always be counted on. But even where there is assent in principle to this special religious character, it is not always easy to avoid statements which provoke dissension. In my ignorance of the state of feeling of many, I must rely on their general candour to judge with tolerance any difference of method, or even of spirit, which they may trace, to bear with what they may consider too exclusive in

the putting forward of the religious side of our threefold system.

I may not end with words of doubt. I believe, I more than believe, that there are some here, I hope many, to whom not any warmth in my advocacy of the Religion, but any deficiency of warmth, is what they most acutely feel, whose whole nature vibrates in unison to any language that bears the stamp of conviction as to the duty of giving that Religion great and unquestioned prominence in all our efforts; who, whether it be in harmony with earlier teaching and long association, or as the conclusion of their maturest judgment, adopted against their old impressions, hesitate not to avow that this Religion is the one only and all-sufficient justification of those efforts, the one source of any strength we have, the one hope for mankind, its propagation the one paramount duty. To them I say, Be equal to your avowal, translate it fully into action, lose no opportunity of proclaiming it; make your belief your life, so that all may see, who are capable of seeing, that it is so. Be careful to cultivate your intellect as the source of light to yourselves or guidance to others; but discipline it with a watchful discipline, for it is prone to mislead, and so much around you tempts to its misdirection; discipline also your will, so that the strong reflection of your character may give strength to all who depend on you, may communicate an impression to all who come near you; discipline your feelings by the habitual encouragement of the higher; in short, let your life be a discipline; no other life is worthy of man, no other draws out our full powers of service, and we want our powers drawn out to the full; nay, we shall wish and pray that they may be so drawn out, if, in older language, the love of Humanity constraineth us, her reasonable service finding them full employment. Faint ye not, neither be weary in that service. It has in it the sense of achievement: look at what has been done by it. We too have heard with our ears and our fathers have declared unto us the noble works she has done in their days and in the old time before them. It has in it the sense of promise: all prophecies centre in the future of Humanity. If it has in it also, and at times almost overpoweringly, the elements of toil and suffering, so inwoven with the others that no thought

can separate them, they are accepted as the common lot, from which we should despise ourselves if we sought exemption; and labour is seen to be indispensable, suffering inevitable, both rightly used ennobling, as both have been the conditions of Humanity's advance, as both have been the conditions of all higher excellence in her servants. They who seek that excellence shrink not from its conditions. Live into her life, and strength will come to you, from sources which as yet are unknown, as from those of which you have tasted. If we lose ourselves in her, or the more we near that consummation, we may not doubt that the old promise will hold good, that we shall find ourselves, our nobler selves, the true reward for ever of human purity, which is unselfishness.

'Forsake all, and thou shalt find all.'

The 'short and complete saying' of older devotion is not the property of one religious faith, but of all, of religion in the most universal sense; it is characteristic of the highest aspiration of the genuine religious life; it falls therefore, by inheritance, to its most perfect embodiment, the Religion of Humanity.

'So mighty art thou, Lady, and so great
That he who grace desireth, and comes not
To thee for aidance, fain would have desire
Fly without wings. Not only him who asks
Thy bounty succours, but doth freely oft
Forerun the asking. Whatsoe'er may be
Of excellence in creature, pity mild,
Relenting mercy, large munificence,
Are all combined in thee.'

DANTE. *Par. xxxiii. (Cary's Translation.)*

THE ANNUAL ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE
POSITIVIST SCHOOL, 19 Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street,
on the Festival of Humanity 90 (1 January, 1878),

APPENDIX.

The translation of the *Politique Positive* of Auguste Comte has been completed in the past year. There is much which I regret about it. I regret the title,* the weight of the book, its cost, the choice of the publisher, the mode of publication; and I feel anxious as to its probable destiny, over which we have no control. But this much said, it is a great thing that we are clear of the labour, and there will be, I hope, a real advantage, though there are certain disadvantages, in its publication. My co-translators will understand my saying little about the work. We offer it, so far I may venture perhaps, all of us in the same spirit, as a contribution to the service of Humanity, a duty discharged in no grudging humour; this, I think, will be generally admitted. On one special point only will I touch, because it is one in which I have no share; viz., the tables of contents, which are so great an aid in the use of each volume, and are, in all cases, so excellently done—in my own volume by one whose loss I increasingly regret as that of a genuine helper in my work, Mr. Lobb. I add to this, what I think all must feel who use the book, a grateful recognition of Mr. Harrison's valuable effort—the index to the whole work at the end of the fourth volume. Those who have not tried can hardly appreciate the trouble that an index involves, though all competent readers will value the result of so much industry, patience, and clearness of arrangement.

* It should be *Positive Politics*, not *Polity*.

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

ANNUAL ADDRESS.*

On the Festival of Humanity, 91 (1 January, 1879).

For the sake of continuity, and in order to use to the full such opportunities as I have, I adhere to my practice of making some introductory remarks on some of the larger questions of political or social interest. In regard to most of them I may be brief, for I have no important alteration to make in what I said at the opening of last year. None look with satisfaction on the provisional settlement effected as to the Eastern Question; no increase of confidence has been gained in the ability of the actual directors of Europe to guide her aright; and the dangers to which I then pointed—the development of Western ambition as regards Asia, and an augmentation of the mutual distrust between ourselves as a leading Western power and the semi-oriental Empire of Russia—are manifest to all as marked features of the actual political condition. We may hope rather than rationally expect that, after all the uncertainties of the last three years, after all the hesitation and unwise shifts that have been adopted, war between the two may yet be avoided. But if it is avoided, it would seem but too likely that such result will be due to some unrighteous compact which shall sacrifice to the ambition of both the interests of weaker powers, the inhabitants of Central Asia—a compact which, begun in wrong, will but adjourn the difficulty and be the fruitful parent of future complications. All that is now being said or done points to one or other of these two methods, both alike deplorable.

Again, the faint hope to which I gave utterance that

* The commemorative form given on pp. 225, 226, applies also to this address.

England would remember her higher obligations to the neglect of her own aggrandisement, has not been justified, while the fear that her conduct would involve us in fresh disgrace has proved but too well founded. Shrinking from the effort of a noble and direct resistance to a policy which she blamed, she chose rather to advance her empire by the acceptance of Cyprus. Under whatever specious pretext the occupation of that island is defended, it is in reality taking her share in the plunder of the power she professed to protect, and thereby compromising, in spite of the acquiescence of the other powers of Europe, her legitimate influence in their councils. That the step brings upon us manifold embarrassments and responsibilities may be true, but it is not on that ground that I would assail it. It may be right and even wise to incur such consequences, even in the face of a probability of failure. But a complete abstinence from further acquisitions, the renunciation of all that could even wear the appearance of direct advantage—this was the conduct which the whole circumstances of the case, and, above all, the prevailing tone of European morality, imperiously prescribed to her Government in the highest interests of the world's due management, and to such considerations her Government and her people have proved blind.

The incentive to such blindness, the warping influence which perverts so fatally the political judgment of our country, the motive for the particular measure which I have been attacking, all are to be found in our Indian Empire, which has dazzled the imagination and vitiated the conscience of England, if we take the nation broadly and judge it by its action on the large scale. A new and unpleasant consequence of that Empire has lately disturbed us in this Afghan war, a fresh obstacle to our contented acquiescence in the acquisition made by the ambition of our forefathers—an acquisition never justifiable as an end, too often, nay almost invariably, not justified in its means. I say a fresh obstacle, for gloomy financial prospects and recurring famines, with their attendant burden of material and moral discredit, have awakened, and are destined increasingly to awaken, our misgivings. Whilst, however, on the matter of this war, it is pleasant to observe signs of a better feeling, to

remember utterances in which morality asserts itself, the nation as a whole cannot be acquitted, for all parties are in essential agreement on the fundamental issue—the retention of India—and the comparatively insignificant discussion what are the particular means demanded to that end need not interest us here. It is well that by one shock after another our countrymen should be driven back on that fundamental issue, such shocks constituting apparently the necessary process by which a public opinion is to be formed alien to the present agreement. So much be said without the remotest thought of condoning the miserable war of which I am speaking.

Worse even than the Afghan war, but passing almost unnoticed whilst attention is concentrated elsewhere, is the struggle at the Cape, which seems to be assuming larger proportions, to be more definitely tending towards a career of South African conquest. In this case, as in India, the same principle is at work; a wrong step once taken must be upheld—such is the language—or the prestige of England would be lowered and her supremacy endangered. No demands, however unjust, but must be pressed to avoid such a consequence. The immorality of such a practice is little thought of, still less the just opposing claims of others. The result is, that we are dependent on any rash or unscrupulous officer who may enter on an untenable course, and the nation finds itself committed to a series of difficulties which its rulers at home would have deprecated, but which they have not the nerve to avoid by a due firmness in revising a mistaken decision. I cannot but think that the annexation of the Transvaal by Sir Theophilus Shepstone is a case in point, and that the act ought to have been at once disavowed, and that officer set aside.

We may hope that if, as seems likely, the Eastern difficulty is for the present less pressing, this African question may be more studied in all its bearings, and the relations of the colonists with the native tribes, as well as the responsibilities of our own Government, thoroughly examined. Our whole colonial action in reference to those amidst whom our emigrants settle demands a searching examination.

There has been visible, it must be allowed, on these

subjects in general, this past year, an increase of that which I noticed last year—the recoil from the aggressive spirit, from the Imperialism which has so long been in the ascendant. It is so wholly without foundation in reason or justice, so repugnant to the higher moral conclusions of man, so contrary to the teachings of either religion, the theological or human, that very imperfect or intermittent attacks are of great power to shake its hold, and lend to our consistent opposition a support which we recognise as most valuable. That consistent opposition, I would further say, has been afresh manifested in an utterance of other London Positivists, which most of you have probably seen. I allude to the protest signed by Mr. Beesly.

All the discussions which ended in the purely provisional settlement effected at Berlin, were of a nature to encourage reflection on this point. Faint indications of a higher spirit were traceable in the proceedings of the Congress, but the more superficial and the predominant tendency was the assertion by each power of its own peculiar interests, as the ultimate reason of its policy. No glimpse is attainable of a concordant action of Western Europe in which those interests should be fused; a negative pressure to make them consistent with the preservation of a hollow peace—that is the utmost point which was reached. Nor could it be otherwise, so far as England is concerned. Her influence, whatever her professions, must be nullified so long as she stands before the world as the most conspicuous representative of European domination over Asiatic or African races, as the most intrusive of all powers where intrusion is safe. An entire revision of her policy in this respect is the indispensable condition, on which we can never insist too often or too strongly, of her having her due weight as an European power; of her being able to contribute as she ought to the establishment of real European union. But the prevalent tone of public morality forbids our looking for any such revision on rational and well-considered grounds, in the exercise of a sound political foresight, inspired by a sound morality. The harsher lessons of experience alone, it would seem, will bring to her a higher wisdom, and there are not wanting signs that such harsher lessons are impending;

there are not wanting signs that the intrusive, aggressive policy which is in question will at no distant period be roughly checked, if not previously modified by prescient reason. I will not speak of external opposition, though there is much in the state of the world to excite reflection on that head, in Europe and out of Europe, but will limit myself to a point which connects with what I said last year in relation to our industrial perplexities.

I spoke then of the great London building strike, which ended in the victory of capital over labour. Similar industrial disturbances have occurred since, and are impending, now in one branch of industry now in another, to-day among the agricultural labourers, to-morrow among the miners. I do not enter on the discussion whether such disturbances are wise or unwise. It seems but too probable that they will be frequent, and equally probable does it appear that they will end in the same way. Not that the failure of one after the other in its immediate object is necessarily the failure of the whole. Though unsuccessful directly, they may modify wholesomely the too hard conditions of labour, through awakening attention to them. But this is not the consideration I have in my immediate view. It is rather, whether the whole industrial problem is not changing for England; whether that commercial supremacy, for which she has schemed, and toiled, and fought, is not passing from her, and her command over the markets of the world destined to end. The internal consequences of her losing this command would naturally be a diminution in the increase of her wealth, so far as it depends on manufacturing production, and a hardening of the conditions of labour by a general reduction of wages, with all its attendant evils—a terrible strain on the well-being of the community. The external consequences are, however, my more immediate object.

An error in principle punishes itself at some time or other. Various causes led to the rapid development of our industry and its accompaniment, the growth of our population, and under the stimulus hence resulting the hunger for new markets, as well as for the monopoly of the old by underselling all rivals, grew inordinately. The principle of unlimited competition, of absolute free trade, was naturally

adopted under the peculiar circumstances of our country as the theoretic basis for her practical conclusions. But it would seem that events are showing that principle to be fraught with danger, as other nations make way in their industrial advance and seek to protect it against a competition which would supersede it. In other words, England will not be allowed to manufacture for the world, but each nation of the civilised world will, within certain limits, supply itself. I use the most general language. But it is sufficient to indicate that a great change in our commercial relations is possible, and that of a nature which may rudely shake her statesmen out of the dream that a nation's true welfare is measured by an exclusive reference to exports and imports. As in so many other respects, so in this also, our thought has been far too material in its tendency. Commercial interests, and not moral considerations, have been the dominant idea in connection with free trade, and the cause of free trade, and the large amount of truth which the doctrine contains have suffered in consequence. It has been blindly urged in too absolute a spirit, and it has broken down. Not less complete is the failure of the doctrine which accompanies it, the theory of unlimited competition. I am here only concerned with one aspect of this theory: that in which it presents itself as the basis of a nation's, of our own nation's, industrial existence. Its danger has been often pointed out, and the warning is receiving confirmation by experience.

The result of such failure in the principles so long in the ascendant, and in the name of which England has been so prosperous in the ordinary sense, must be to cripple her power and to increase the sense of her burden. Her Imperial policy, as it is called, her colonial and dependent Empire, are, after all has been said, a heavy item in that burden, one calculated for fair weather and growing resources. Combine the two difficulties, the internal and the external, and the change which no reason and no morality had power to work may be imposed by imperious necessity. All the false glitter which attaches to the adjuncts of England, and makes them seem essential to her welfare, will be detected under the test of a long industrial pressure and its sure accompaniment, a searching inquiry into its origin and causation.

The truth is that all these adjuncts, this Indian Empire, this vast colonial aggregate, these constant acquisitions and annexations, are cherished under the influence of ideas radically alien to the new order which is dawning. They are the rags and tatters of an older state. For the same difficulty runs throughout. We are in the conflict of two forms of social existence wholly incompatible with each other, but the complete victory of one over the other is a slow process. Industrialism as against the remnants of mediæval feudalism, under all the successive disguises which have adapted it to meet each new exigency; positive science as against the earlier explanations of the phenomena which are the common aliment to both modes of thought; a human religion as opposed to and seeking to substitute itself for that based on theology; these are the three forms which the conflict assumes as we rise in the succession. During its progress there is necessarily much confusion: men cannot clear themselves easily of that which is outworn, for it has been the very framework of their early associations. The ideas of empire and of conquest have exercised a fascination which is not easily broken; and under its bondage we cling to the outward symbols when all that gave them a real value is gone from them. At home as abroad, in the government of England as in the management of the various dependencies which she has planted or clutched, we have to face this conclusion—that all statesmanship, as every wise direction of opinion, should set before it as its aim the consistent elimination of all obstacles to the triumph of that form of society which the whole history of the past shows to have been in constant growth, and so warrants our supposing certain to prevail. That form is the industrial. The Government, therefore, should become purely industrial; our Empire be detached from us by a careful process as an obstacle to its becoming so, if only by its steady diversion of attention from the problem how it is to become so.

The remarks seem to take an exclusively English application, but they are not in spirit so limited. They apply to the whole Western world, with no exception even for its colonial settlements. Though for these last some deductions may seem necessary, owing to their peculiar circumstances

which appear to involve a complete breach with the past, consequently an emancipation from its ideas. But with a recognition of a certain amount of truth in this way of looking at their case, there comes the consideration that they are essentially the children of their fathers, and under the dominion of the same notions which prevail in the countries from which they are offshoots. It is one strong argument in favour of ending the connection which binds to England the colonies which yet remain to her, that its severance would precipitate their abandonment of that which is effete and the full adoption of the new industrial order. Be this as it may, I return to what I was saying as to the unity of the West in respect of the difficulties which beset it, owing to the conflict between two incompatible forms of social existence. If we wanted a more palpable instance even than that of England—an instance in which the contrast stands out in the harshest, most glaring manner—we have but to turn to the German Empire, with its somewhat brutal struggle between its retrograde militarism, instinct with the worst spirit of feudalism, and the newer industrialism under the peculiar features of a rather anarchical socialism. And this struggle by no means excludes the others. We may easily discover in Germany, if in a special form, the contest between positive science and the older beliefs, theological or metaphysical; as also, though again in a special form, that between the rising belief in a Humanity superior to all national distinctions and an intense clinging to the most narrow nationalism. Equally, if in varying degree, all countries of Europe, properly so called, are being torn and rent by the spirit of the Past, which the present is as yet unable to exorcise, waiting for the master doctrine which is alone competent to the task.

I but indicate such questions; there will be other opportunities of dealing with them; and many similar questions must be omitted altogether. With a few observations on the countries which are more intimately connected with the advent of the new Religion, and especially France, I will leave this portion of to-day's address. The unrest of the world, a current expression, may appear less applicable immediately to France than to her sister nations. For Italy is seen by all to be in a most perturbed state, and precisely

from the same causes as I have dwelt on above. Spain is less known and understood, but occasionally there are significant symptoms of an analogous condition. And, added to the internal disturbance, there is now a force working from without on those two countries which must be taken into account. Spain's susceptibility as to the French ambassador points to the same conclusion as a recent utterance of the most prominent French statesman, the conclusion that the establishment of the Republic in France is acting as a leaven in countries which so immediately feel her influence as the two under consideration. All the later history of both warrants us in expecting that it would be so, for it has more than once shown, apart from all the stimulus of a successful experiment external to themselves, that both have in them a more or less influential Republican party, the direct outgrowth of their own national development.

Less agitated, more self-reliant and contented than Italy or Spain, in the enjoyment of a high relative degree of prosperity, we cannot yet look on the state of France as an exceptional one, as endowed that is with an immunity from the evils which afflict her equals. It is much that her Republican form lasts. We wish it, all of us, to last on for ever; but consistently with its lasting there are yet grave difficulties unmet. I will say no more than that in a democratic and parliamentary Republic, resting on universal suffrage, in the co-existence of an active Catholic organisation with a purely negative emancipation, which most frequently, moreover, is incomplete, all Positivists must see elements of danger which no provisional calm can wholly disguise, much less remove.

I have latterly on these occasions abstained from comment on our own action as English Positivists, and, so far as any history of our immediate past is concerned, I adhere to this abstention as more than ordinarily desirable. But this year has seen, and you have the sign of it in your hands, a step in advance in regard to the slow creation of a liturgy, a want to which I gave expression in my second sermon, for the year 72 (1860). All such services as that which have to-day (the form of it is due to the thoughtful co-operation of two members, and, with allowance for the accident

failure of the portrait, is I think very successful)—all such services, I say, I look upon as rudimentary and tentative, meeting as occasion arises a distinct demand, and open to modification and enlargement to any extent. The demand was for something which might give a definitely religious character to our ordinary Sunday meetings, and take from them their predominantly intellectual aspect, which could in no wise adequately awaken our feelings. Even this slight expression has been of gradual growth, and the particular addition of to-day is the direct introduction of the congregation in the short sentences which precede the sermon, with its usual preface of a liturgical character. Other additions will come in time. The one which is the most to be wished, and yet which cannot be made under our present circumstances, were it only from the consideration of our number, is that of some hymns; if possible, with accompaniment, but without, if that is not to be had. Meanwhile we use what we have, and, little as it is, it may be of advantage to us here, whilst it has in it the further good that it may be a bond of communion by its use for all the members of our too-dispersed society. I have the pleasure of thinking that it has already served this purpose in more than one instance. Such simple primary steps are very difficult and of high ulterior importance.

I touch as shortly as I can on the present condition of the Positivist body, and on its division. Mindful of the religious character of this meeting I would avoid all words of irritation. I seek rather to establish our own position than to speak of others. Painful as the responsibility was of changing the pre-existent order, it seemed to me, as to others, that it was a duty from which we might not shrink; that the taking it upon ourselves was the indispensable condition of a right presentment of the Religion of Humanity as the one paramount consideration; that a bolder, fuller, more direct assertion of the religious aspect of our doctrine was the essential want; lastly, that the worship in some form or other must precede the teaching in a more marked degree than it had hitherto done. The extreme slowness of our progress we thought due, and the words of our common Master warrant our so thinking, to our own imperfect

appreciation of, and insistence upon, this truth, more than to any external obstacle. We did not feel warranted by our experience, much less by the course of the discussion when the issue was once raised, in looking for any decided change in regard to this defect on the part of the then direction. The only alternative then was, either to acquiesce in that which we thought so imperfect, or, by a new combination, to attain complete freedom for working out our own conception of the true method to be pursued. We chose the latter course as the right one—as the best means of arousing and enforcing attention to so capital a problem. When I say *We*, I include with myself the eminent French disciples of Auguste Comte, whose competence to form a judgment on the past conduct and present exigencies of our cause can hardly be contested. It is therefore a combined action of French and English Positivists, and the group which is its result is in the fullest sense Western; adheres strictly to that most important principle of avoiding all merely national formations. We are in full communion with the only other constituent of the West which furnishes religious disciples. The mere number is not to be unduly insisted on. The new Religion at its beginning must evidently set itself above such a consideration. Had my dissatisfaction with our progress been limited to myself, or shared only by my English co-religionists, I should have kept it to myself and never stirred in the matter, so entirely do I accept the above principle as overruling all others in relation to such a question.

Our choice has involved us all for the time in great unpleasantness; in much that is really and permanently painful, so far at any rate as the older members are concerned. I have never seen the necessity for such consequences. We are, in the widest extension given to our numbers, but few. There is ample room for the energies of all, and if those energies could be more fully called into play when distinct than in a given combination we might renounce this combination.

The difficulties in which English Positivists more particularly at present find themselves are not of quite recent origin, nor have they come upon us unforeseen. It is three years since

I wrote as follows: 'It may be that we may have to meet worse times than we have yet met; that we may see the break up of our present organisation, the dispersion of its members, the love of many waxing cold; their faith failing them from impatience or other human weaknesses, their aid denied us from yielding to some of the noblest, or being led astray by some of the most contemptible of our impulses; or it may be simply a time of slower progress, of less hope, the depressing tedium of a long halt. Whatever the particular form of the evil, I doubt not that some of us are resolved to hold on, whether alone or in company—whether standing shoulder to shoulder with those who have hitherto been with us, or deprived of their support, or even exposed to their active hostility; that through honour and dishonour, through evil report and good report, some will continue faithful to the end to the noble cause which they have made their own. No passing gloom will make them renounce their service, even though their dispersion and isolation may be such that to the common judgment anything that might be called a social organ of the new Religion may have ceased to exist. I do not think, looking at all the circumstances, that in this and the generation or two which will follow, such a course of our movement is impossible.' Such words are less hopeful than what we may now use; for amidst all the pain and difficulty, the assurance of the strength of our cause—I speak with reference to all the disciples without exception—stands out doubly sure. The trial has come and there has been no disposition perceptible to fall back. Pressing out of sight any complications, the essential discussion has been as to the desirability of a given course, and amidst all the differences which have arisen there has been evolved a greater activity than had previously existed. I have been also much struck by the importance attached to our movement by some who previously had been rather spectators than actors, but whose judgment in this respect is of value in my eyes; nor the less so that on the special issue it has generally gone against my action. It is a great thing to find that the weakness numerically of its advocates, which is patent to all, does not blind those whose acceptance of our system is but partial

and most conditional, to the power and promise of the doctrine nor to the value of an organ for its propagation. The particular constitution of the organ is another matter and of relatively inferior interest. Composite or unified, it can serve the purpose on which we all are agreed—the reorganisation of human society through the establishment of the new Religion.

For ourselves, as a special portion of the composite organ now constituted by the aggregate of disciples, what should be our conduct? in what spirit must we act in relation to our actual position? Very shortly I would say that we have to move on in quiet confidence without either yielding to or stimulating the opposition to which we are exposed. In all human changes such divergences have been as it were the law; it was almost inevitable that we should offer no exception; such are the antecedents of our very mixed body, such the milieu from which it has been drawn. Add to this the premature death of our founder and guide, leaving no one competent to take his place. Had he lived to 'teach us what a Pontiff should be,' we might have escaped most of our present embarrassments. But, left to ourselves, with a many-sided doctrine, and one whose greatest development was, by the necessity of the case, most perfect in the direction to which its author assigned the secondary, subordinate place—a doctrine, therefore, not complete and rounded off to his wish in all its parts, but overweighted in its intellectual as compared with the practical and religious constituent—it was hardly to be hoped that we should escape a divergence such as the present, which turns ultimately on the relative immediate importance of these two distinct, yet in our system inseparable, constituents. Recognising the probability beforehand of such a difficulty, capable from our study of history and man's nature of explaining at once its gravity and its provisional, passing character, seeing also how with a wise forbearance it may be turned to good account though a matter for deep regret, we may bend ourselves to our proper work, the enforcement on others, the ingraining into ourselves of the Religion we profess, as able by its direct propagation to secure most shortly the result we all have in view.

There is one evil which we have to guard against, the tendency to be looking outside of ourselves and watching the action of others. We may strengthen ourselves on this point by the following reflections: We, as representatives of the new Religion, are in the world a collective spirituality, aiming at the direct guidance of its affairs. But in our weakness we must wait for such direct influence, and meanwhile exercise as much indirect as we can, using, so far as they are available, all existing social forces, and modifying them to our purpose. For instance, we wish to spread a true scientific instruction as part of our educational scheme. We have not the means to do this directly, having neither the teachers nor the pupils. But so far as the lower sciences are concerned, even including biology, there is a great and general, if not always well directed, effort being made to imbue the young with them. We can see much in the methods and the spirit in which they are taught from which we differ, but we can also see that the general movement is, under all the conditions of our modern life, susceptible of receiving an impulse of a different kind. We may therefore look upon our work as being done for us where we could not do it ourselves, and feel, in consequence, free to devote our own time and energy, limited as they must necessarily be, to the teaching those subjects which more immediately connect with the above-mentioned impulse. In a higher sphere, I might take the various religious movements which we are witnessing. Our own direct conversions are so few as to be at times discouraging even to the most patient, but as our task is the revival of the religious feeling and the reinvigoration of our higher moral nature, which the Western Revolution has so shaken, we can allow that in their wide variety all the forms of religious revival are doing some part of our work, and whilst conducing even now to the end we aim at, are preparing, again under the conditions of modern existence which are necessarily sapping the foundations of theological belief, the minds and hearts of men for our own non-theological belief, with which those same conditions are radically in accordance.

These two instances are sufficient to explain what I mean, when I say that within the area of Positivism, we

who would more immediately center our efforts on the direct preaching of Humanity, may avail ourselves with satisfaction of the exertions of others who lean rather more to the intellectual propagation of the system. We must not at this point forget that Positivism in Europe—nor only in Europe, but in, to us, so important a field as Europeanised India, as also in Russia—is not identified with our small body but with the name and the followers of Messrs. Littré and Mill. The former is considered as the most rational exponent of the doctrine. Imperfect and misleading as is the exposition which he gives, we can allow and shall recognise the fact later, that the wide extension even of that is a service rendered, a preparation made, an inroad upon the adverse mental constitution which is the great obstacle intellectually. We have ample reason to regret that the work is not more thoroughly done, in more accordance with the spirit of Comte's construction. We cannot conceal from ourselves the amount of hindrance it creates by its negative character, but neither should we hesitate to allow it its own measure of utility. If we can do this when the interval is so wide, and with reference to a presentation which would avowedly crush our own were it in its power, there can be no difficulty in regard to those who theoretically are in complete agreement with us but whose presentation is to our minds in deficient agreement with their theory. Manifestly their labours will converge to the same result as ours, though they choose a method, as we think, less in accordance with the teachings and spirit of Auguste Comte, as it is less in accordance with the religious traditions of Humanity, and by virtue of these two defects is a method which hampers our advance in the sense of extension, and exercises a prejudicial influence on our own best progress, our religious advance intensively considered. From this standpoint of a quiet judgment we may clear ourselves of all irritation. Whatever increase of energy or numbers there may be is a gain to the common cause, and whichever of the two tendencies is most in conformity with the real exigencies of our task will be sure, ultimately, to prevail, to the just subordination, in no way to the exclusion, of the other. The Religion which we both believe will not have power perhaps to remove all

personal differences, any more than its predecessor, nor to heal all the wounds inflicted in the course of our discussion; but it will have power, I am inclined to believe, to keep us in substantial agreement even now, and sooner or later to harmonise any discrepancies in our respective conceptions of the most suitable means to be employed.

From a more personal point of view the dispersion of the members of our group is to us all a source of difficulty as of discouragement, for it deprives us of that stimulus which numbers give, as also of the strength due to ready concert. I feel it myself in two ways: it increases my labour in correspondence, it makes all my work here harder. The very small attendance at our ordinary meetings—it need not be as small as it is were there a proper sense of duty—is a great pressure, as it will no doubt impair our efficiency. It has always done so hitherto, even when it was somewhat larger than what we can now have. I make allowance for our exceptional conditions, but I must press the necessity of effort in the direction here indicated.

Still no dispersion, no isolation, no increase of burden, must weigh against the duty of setting forth the Religion of Humanity in all its completeness, to the utmost measure of our power. And whatever the action of others, we are ultimately dependent on ourselves for the discharge of this duty, and should find in it a sufficient satisfaction. I look to it as one of the best results of the present crisis, that it will add depth and strength to the convictions of most Positivists, leaving a valuable influence when the great soreness it has produced shall have passed away. We had, take us as a whole, been too passive; in all directions there will for the future be greater thought exerted, a more general sense of individual responsibility in relation to the furtherance of our common object.

We are not, or we should not be, of those who concern ourselves about immediate results, looking for some striking success rapidly attained. And in proportion as we free ourselves from the weakening effects of this tendency do we lie open to the full influence of that confidence in its ultimate triumph which our Religion warrants, and under such influence do we estimate at their just value the passing

complications. For we live by it in the past and in the future in order to gain a sound judgment of the present and the power to modify it wisely, with deliberate resolution meeting each particular conjuncture as it arises, and shaping our course in the best way we can according to the facts of our changing existence. The object we set before us, the spirit in which we work for its attainment, these are the cardinal points, and true to them we are independent in a high degree of the rest. Nothing can interfere with us so far. None can lower them, none can take from us our power to forward them, so long, that is, as life and liberty are left us, things not now in question. I doubt whether, essentially, any can even lessen that power, the means generally adopted being often more suicidal than injurious to us—a lesson which the ordinary party contentions around us might teach all observers. On such grounds then we may move forward hopefully, not indifferent to, but not depressed by, the annoyances attendant on the present excitement in our particular world. We can all help in allaying that excitement, and the moderate spirit generated by the thoughtful, hardly visible, yet most real intervention of all, would conduce more than anything to lessen what evil there is in our present state, and to its satisfactory modification in the future.

It was almost impossible not to speak on this point; it is a pleasure to turn from it to the more proper subject. It will be found a continuation of my four last annual addresses, which have all dealt directly with the Religion of Humanity as a new Catholicism succeeding and superseding the older or Roman Catholicism, a Catholicism, therefore, which for a time must take some distinctive epithet such as the one I have used; till the day shall arrive, when this Human Catholicism being completely triumphant, this historical necessity shall no longer exist, for all contrast will have disappeared. As we are yet, however, necessarily in such contrast, it has been my object, to the exclusion as far as I could of the critical negative spirit, to throw light at once on the religious history of our Western world, and on the intrinsic superiority of the new Faith which has arisen within its limits, by a careful comparison of the two Churches which alone I consider in serious competition, the Mediæval

or Roman, and the Positive or Human. The comparison has taken the two in various lights, and it has aimed most of all at establishing this great truth, that the later is but the perfecting of the earlier institution, the successful accomplishment of the task which the noble effort of its predecessor had proved unequal to accomplish; that the whole religious movement from the close of Antiquity to the creation of the Positive religion is entirely one in this sense: that its first part was the primary, incomplete solution of a problem, the final solution of which has been given by the second. Looking at the two parts in this light, we naturally conclude that there is not any breach of continuity, any opening for hostility, any defect of sympathy between them, and as naturally, that we may betake ourselves to the earlier construction with a certainty of finding in its principles, methods, and true spirit, much light and guidance in our understanding and appropriation of the more recent. So we explain the observed affinities between Positivism and Mediæval Catholicism.

Whilst this has been one great object of the comparison, it has also aimed at manifesting the superiority of our own Religion, and that on the special point which constitutes its most distinctive characteristic, its complete continuity. It contains within itself that which no other religion has contained, the reconciliation of all history—to borrow a phrase which I have seen lately. I endeavoured last year to show that there was in St. Paul's mind an instinctive sense of a defect in his system under this aspect, and that in his way, and with the most judicious use of the materials at his command, he tried to supply it, but that his attempt could not be accepted as successful; as also that no similar attempt could be successful on the basis of theology. It is only in Humanity that all ages and faiths can be at one. She alone can reconcile man to man.

The question then arises how best to set forth the truth, how can we most efficiently preach Humanity? and on this question of method I went into some detail in last year's address. It is condensed in the motto which is prefixed to that address. Humanity needs no demonstration; that which she has produced leads us naturally to her, as do the

two great notions of the Family and the Country. Hence, the naturalness of the process that is, we explain the rapidity with which the conception, now fully worked out, is taking possession of the thoughts of men, and, as a symbol of such possession, is penetrating their language. It is by virtue of the same character that we can trace in the nobler natures of the past, in their action or in their speculation, such frequent recognition of the conception when it could only be imperfectly apprehended, and when it was, if explicitly stated, in contradiction as it were with the prevailing doctrines and practice.

We rise to the conception of Humanity by the contemplation of her products. Is it not so? On us who live in the midst of this vast accumulation of those products, which we call London, this truth on its material side is borne in with irresistible power when once the mind is awakened. A trivial expression in common use has its application here, 'God made the country, Man the town.' Its greater or less truth I do not examine; but for my purpose it testifies to the acceptance of Humanity as the real agent in our more visible advance, in all that connects with the ceaseless onward march of industry, the earliest sphere of Positive thought, the persistent and fundamental obstacle to the triumph of theology. One amidst the numerous similar, if unequal, centres of human activity, London is a sufficient image to direct and support our thoughts when we would vividly present to ourselves the agency of the power we serve. We know that it has been a gradual creation through many generations of men, each bringing its contribution, at times of healthfulness and beauty, at times of the reverse; for, on a great historical city like this the oscillations of man's right perceptions and imaginative power imprint themselves together with its growth. We see at every turn that gradual creation still in progress, still under a spontaneous impulse, and not under wise direction: in this again a symbol of the power to which it owes its origin. But under all variations and with all drawbacks, we all allow, we all feel, the continuity of the effort and the grandeur of the product evolved, the capabilities for future use that are stored up, the shelter it has afforded the higher aims of the past generations. The con-

temptation of such a product should render easy the conception of Humanity, should by a natural process lead us into her presence. True she is not as yet inducted into her rightful possession; her vicegerent still claims her work as consecrated to himself; this city's most gorgeous temples, the Abbey of St. Peter, the Cathedral of St. Paul, with all their subordinates, yet belong to the older and provisional faith; but we find no obstacle in this, and by an easy exertion of the historical imagination, as we worship in them, we can antedate their definitive appropriation, as we can even now, by an exertion of sympathy, apply to our own benefit the beautiful services which they freely offer.

Again, in a different domain, where the effort is somewhat greater, the same conception is yet attainable. The poetry of the human race is, as much as its industry, a product of Humanity. Intimately bound up with each successive phase of man's existence it has ever borne the impress of his varying notions and of the dominant ideas, and thus its symbolism has been largely theological. It has been an incomplete service of the true power. But by this very adaptation which is its necessity, it offers us a large variety of such theological symbolism, and thereby destroys that unity which is the essence of religion, and introduces those who wisely drink as freely as they can of its inspiration to the idea of contradictory and mutually destructive beliefs; to the desire for one in which all contradictions disappear. This by the way. I am more concerned, immediately, with the gradual construction which we can evoke by an effort when we turn our thought on the progress of mankind, the 'vision of poets' all consentient to one end—the idealising man and man's life in all its rich complexity. Each great type of that 'royal race' feels himself a stone in the living temple, which they by their succession gradually raise, each 'shining to the measure of his light, and being content.'

Ch'essi mi fecer della loro schiera,
Sì ch'io fui sesto tra cotanto senno.

The special continuous whole the poets form testifies to the larger whole which contains it, and facilitates the conception of that of which they have been the prophets in the past as they will be its æsthetic interpreters in the future.

More directly their labours, combined into one continuous stream of song, as we in our teaching endeavour to combine them, present us with a treasure of human accumulation from which, in grateful reverence and due thankfulness to the giver, we can draw freely for all the better purposes of our life, for the cultivation and expression of our emotional nature.

And as it is with poetry so it is with the other acts of expression, through sound or form. All in their varying degree, and with differences which admit of a social explanation, are continuous products of Humanity, and each might serve, if we stopped to contemplate its history, to furnish us with a special help to the bringing before us her real existence. Some are more partial and intermittent than others, but such differences are unimportant here. In all, those least familiar with them may by a short consideration of the names connected with them convince themselves that the considerations which apply to poetry apply to them also. We can carry our thoughts back to their rudimentary existence and see them under the action of man's social life develop into the very great beauty which every one of them has reached; as we can also easily imagine that under the action of the same influence when strengthened, man's social life raised and beautified, each of them is destined to rise with it to a higher beauty, or at any rate to a larger, more powerful, more wholesome application.

Whilst I am speaking of these various forms of expression I must briefly notice the most universal of all, the most precious of all, as being the highest instrument of communication, and as such the primary instrument of our advance in well-being. Language, I use the word in its general, most usual acceptation, is, as the others, a gradual construction of Humanity. This is true of each special language, our own as much as any other, the steps in the formation of which we can trace as accurately as our purpose requires. It is true also if we carry our thoughts onward to the time when, superposed on these special languages, which, by their diversity, aptly represent the disunion of mankind, and are a hindrance of great potency to all its progress, there shall extend throughout the world one language of universal

adoption, the symbol of the definitive constitution of Human Unity—its reconstitution, we might say, if we used the old legend, which instinctively struck the truth and that more deeply than at first appears, when it pointed to the confusion of tongues as the instrument of man's dispersion, and associated that dispersion with the interests of the God-Idea, the maintenance of its power as against its human substitute.

Such universal language will be a gradual adaptation to the wants of all of one of the existing languages, and will doubtless bear the impress of such gradual adaptation and have the faculty of admitting further modifications with the growing thought of men. Its creation has been the object of hope and anticipation to the imaginative thinkers of the past, and must continue as yet a hope and an anticipation. Meanwhile each special language is enough for our present subject.

Passing from art in the ordinary sense as the medium of expression, and as distinct from the arts which deal directly with man, as education and government, we find in science again a confirmation of the truth here insisted on, that each separate attainment of man's energy is a product of Humanity, and facilitates our conception of her. Take science in its fullest constitution, and as fused into one imposing whole by the highest philosophical genius; or take any one of the separate portions of such whole, and we shall equally find that in the slowly elaborated product we can trace the accumulation of the efforts of generations, the onward march of an existence whose organs are in a constant state of disappearance and renewal, but whose essential unity through all such changes remains unimpaired.

So again with what I but now referred to, the educational and political arts; however imperfect they still remain, we can see that they bear witness to the same effect. What has yet been reached in them may be, probably is, but the heaping up of materials ready for the builder's hand, a succession of experiences of more or less value, but, whatever the name we give them, they are the work of human intellect and the groundwork for a human construction. Distinct and antagonistic as they have too often been in the past, the conceptions or schemes of education and of polity are be-

come, or will become, convergent under the shapings of later thought, all ministering to the one end—the establishment of the definitive principles on which man shall be trained, of the definitive societies in which he shall put that training to its legitimate use.

Once more, in the highest sphere of all, and the one at first sight most alien to our position, that of religion, through the contemplation of her products we rise to Humanity. Each religion in turn, the more closely it is examined, is seen to bear more evidently the stamp of the thought and feelings of its believers, is seen to be made in their own image. This truth, long the possession of the more philosophical, has become the widely accepted conclusion of ordinary, thinkers, and, like so many others, often colours the statements of those who are most adverse to it. If rejected for their own particular belief, it is accepted for all others.

Any one of the more conspicuous theological religions might serve to verify these remarks. It is not my purpose to do this here; nor do I wish to take up your time in showing how they all contribute to the one final and universal Religion, the highest product of the ascending religious experience of mankind.

As in this rapid enumeration we pass in review the several provinces of thought and action, we by an almost unconscious process effect completely that substitution which is our real aim. We find one after another in the possession of man, of Humanity, to the satisfactory exclusion of the older idea, without any necessity for an unpleasant disputatious war upon it, an exclusion by a proper positive method, that of supplying the place it provisionally filled. Industry, Art, Science, Philosophy, Polity, all speak of Man, and with Religion, which is the crown of Philosophy and Polity, we come into the immediate presence of the Power we serve, and into direct contact with the duty of proclaiming her, of preaching her religion. On the method to be adopted, and on our estimate of the relative value of what to us are necessarily interdependent, the intellectual preparation, and the more concrete, more synthetic presentation, I spoke last year, giving to this last the preference, as the means

of propagating our faith, not doubting that it will amply ensure the other, the due cultivation of the intellect, as an indispensable instrument at once and satisfaction. In fact, all that I have been to-day saying might show how secure we are against any undue depression of our intelligence. By her composite and continuous formation, Humanity exercises our contemplation and our meditation in a very different way and degree than they were exercised under her several predecessors. Think of the power for intellectual development that is latent in the mere tracing out, at first in outline, then in more detail, the several constructions I have mentioned. As in regard to one after the other we evoke the ages and the nations, and the individual great names which have emerged in the work, we must feel that there is no room for any alarm lest our mental horizon be too narrow, our faculties be deprived of their due nourishment.

The true danger lies elsewhere. It is our emotional nature that is threatened, for we are exposed to the forgetting, in the multiplicity and interest of the products, the source of their production. Hence the priority assigned to this central idea, and next in the series to the direct cultivation of our feelings: there is comparatively no recognition of excess in these two respects. There may be such excess, and the liability to it will at a future period be greater than it is now, but in our actual mental and moral state it is very small, and our chief precautions must be against the opposite evil.

But enough on this comparison. Beyond all comparison the more important consideration for all is the moral culture on which I have been lately dwelling in our Sunday meetings. It is by the fashioning of ourselves and our lives that we shall best serve. Convictions spread and strengthen by contact; our sentiments are enlarged at once and vivified by the sense of their participation; but the life which is the expression of the sum of our habits remains the most powerful of all contagious influences, for it is the only solid guarantee of the reality of our convictions and sentiments. In this age of talk and writing, so much tends to obscure this truth that it is well for us to remind ourselves of it, well to remember that what we are is the supreme point, and that for others no less than ourselves, as centres of conversion,

if I may use the term, no less than for the truthfulness of our own being. It is fortunate that it is so, for this alone is in the power of all. Underneath all the ceaseless flow of utterances which wastes energy and absorbs attention the quiet influence of lives and characters devoted to a great cause will most promote that cause, the more in proportion as that cause is a religion.

Undervaluing no means, then, but in the conviction that this last means is at once the best for ourselves as for others, we have to proceed unhesitatingly in the course we have chosen—in the service, I mean, of the Power in whom we believe. We have to make our belief more sure and more efficacious by thought and sympathy; we have to impart it to others by the same means—by thought and by the sympathy we give and excite. We can never exhaust the power in this respect inherent in the object of our adoration and submission. 'Man is akin to and the friend of man,' says Aristotle, and we need not scruple to enlarge the meaning of his language and adapt it to our use. By no condescension, no putting off a higher nature, but by her own nature and constitution, Humanity is one with us, and we are one with her. She needs no mediator, she appeals directly to her worshippers and servants. The strength of this simplicity has yet to be fully understood; the power, that is, there lies in the straightforwardness of the relation. Even now, we can trace its influence on others and on ourselves in the increased clearness of our mental vision, in the increased intelligibility of our action; I add with conviction, in the enlargement and purification of our moral nature—benefits which in a wise combination tend to perpetuate and propagate themselves. But, whether we can trace it or no, it exists, a possession for all time, and open to the appropriation of all without detriment, one of the countless treasures within the reach of our own and all succeeding generations.

At the opening of a New Year, on the recurrence of this Festival, whatever our troubles, private or public, if there be any discouragement, and from whatever source, we, the disciples of Humanity, should be able to accept the support she can so largely minister to all her servants and worshippers, if not from the anticipations of the future, at any rate

he sympathetic recollection of her past. She, the
 ng mother, has stood by the suffering generations of
 s, drawing from their suffering the great yet imperfect
 which we profit by and increase. Their lot is ours ;
 gled suffering and success we contribute our share to
 dually increasing result. More it were weakness to
 is our wisdom to find a sufficient happiness in this.
 the ease of life, but in its pain and difficulty, met and
 ne, lies the true sphere for all that is highest and
 in us, for that which constitutes our better selves.
 secrate we these to Humanity with gratitude and
 y.

So mighty art thou, Lady, and so great,
 That he who grace desireth, and comes not
 To thee for aidance, fain would have desire
 Fly without wings. Not only him who asks
 Thy bounty succours, but doth freely oft
 Forerun the asking. Whatsoe'er may be
 Of excellence in creature, pity mild,
 Relenting mercy, large munificence,
 Are all combined in thee.—DANTE, *Par.* xxxiii. (CARY).

ANNUAL ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE
 OSITIVIST SCHOOL, 19 Chapel Street, Bedford Row, W.C.,
 on the Festival of Humanity 91 (1 January, 1879.)

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

ANNUAL ADDRESS.*

On the Festival of Humanity, 92 (1 January, 1880).

We met last night to commemorate the dead and so to place ourselves under the weight of one of the two great subjective constituents of Humanity, that one which must always most affect us. To-day we stand more directly in presence of both her subjective constituents—her Past and her Future—and would from both gain insight and strength for our conduct in the Present, which thus completes our conception and connects it with our practice. Yet even for this Present, such are the circumstances of our small nascent church, in a sense the subjective element is uppermost, the absent members are more numerous, that is, than those who are with us, and will therefore, in a great degree, direct my course in this Address. If in some parts there should appear a repetition to those who attend our regular meetings, or a statement of things with which they are already familiar, they must not forget this consideration. It brings with it a good in its power to brace us by the thought of those who are with us in spirit and would most gladly be with us in person, were it not for the obstacles of health, means, or distance. In proportion as we train ourselves in the practice of our worship, private and public, this spiritual communion, annihilating the separation in space, will become more easy and more useful. Those who live constantly with the dead and the unborn will find it no hard matter to call absent friends to share in what they are doing; so closely do all parts of our true, our religious life, fit into one another with a strong cohesion.

Last night our communion with the dead could not but

* The commemorative form given on pp. 225, 226, applies also to this address.

have much of sadness in it—sorrow without gloom—from the thought of all the trouble through which Humanity had had to pass before her Advent—the labour and the waste of her seed time—though after all allowance the good had prevailed, as we saw reason to admit. To-day, when we turn to her in her more proper existence, we might hope to throw aside all hesitation—all thought of allowance to be made—to be able, by a right interpretation of her in the Past, to dwell on the confident expectation of her glorious Future, with a fair satisfaction in an imperfect, but yet visibly advancing Present. It is not so, however. It can hardly be so for some time to come, if we call our judgment into council and face the actual with deliberate courage. Here, again, but in no gloomy spirit, we must admit a large admixture of trouble—we must admit that the Advent of Humanity is destined to no exemption from the general law which we trace in all previous similar changes. When I say this, I would not be for a moment understood to imply that it is her Advent, as—placing myself in a more or less distant future which shall call this time old, I make bold to speak of her ushering in into the hearts and language of men—the hearts of a few, the language of many—I say I would not be understood to imply that the disturbed state of the world which we recognise as a fact, is in any way due to this new truth which is just touching the summits of human thought. No; it is as yet true of her what was said of her predecessor, she cometh not by observation—less true, perhaps, but still, in a great measure, true. But when we examine the disturbance which we see around us, we shall not be slow to feel that over and above the evil in it which has no connection with the new Religion, it is by its origin and character such as to oppose every kind of negative obstacle to the acceptance of that Religion, such, moreover, as to be likely to issue in the most active attempt to crush it when it is seen to be gaining power. Be this as it may, it is certain that, immediately, we are on this, as on former occasions, confronted on all sides by the gravest difficulties, that we cannot escape the consciousness of great trouble.

The past year does not leave us with any feeling that the sum of our embarrassments as a nation has been lessened. In its whole course, its political, industrial, and moral, history

has been too much in keeping with its gloomy physical constitution. It has brought us again, as a nation, certain successes as they are called: but I am not aware that in any one of them we can feel any pleasure: with scarcely an exception, our moral nature recoils from them more than it would from defeats. They all demand reparation; and we are but too sure that none will be given. I mean—in order to leave no room for doubt—that the honour of England demands the reversal of the decision taken as to the Transvaal; and here there is a gleam of hope, for one public man stands committed to such reversal by his language. I mean, again, that her sense of right should lead, after the punishment of Sir Bartle Frere, to the restoration of the Zulu king: a measure also, I feel convinced, which policy would dictate, under the peculiar circumstances of our South African colonies. I mean, lastly, that England should retrace her steps in Afghanistan—fall back on the frontier from which she started on this unjust war, punish the authors of the brutal vengeance taken on a nation in consequence of its legitimate resistance, whatever place those authors occupy—be they foreign or Indian secretaries, viceroy, or general—and by every subsequent act recognise the independence of the Afghan people. So we might, in some measure, nationally atone for our disgraceful success.

So much for the Past, where great brevity is allowed, as others have spoken during the year, and the unity of the Positivist judgment, which stands out amidst passing differences, renders it unnecessary for me to recur to the points treated. I allude to the condemnation of the Zulu war by Dr. Bridges, the condemnation of our conduct in Afghanistan by Mr. Harrison and Mr. H. Crompton, and the general judgment of the latter on the dominant tendency of our national feeling in relation to what is called Imperialism.

On any present complications, again, I shall touch but slightly. In many cases, there is no marked change, and could therefore but repeat what I have said before. This is true of all industrial questions, not even excepting that of the land—great as the movement is seen to be in this last case so great as to call for a separate treatment on an occasion better suited to it. It is true, with one exception, of any that

can be properly called political questions, with which now, as before, we here are not bound to concern ourselves much, as we look for, trust in, no political solution of the disorder of society. Less than any can we be bound to interest ourselves in the political agitation which is going on around us. We may and must watch it, for we cannot wish to abstract ourselves from our social surroundings; and it is possible, moreover, that it may be leading us to more critical issues than what are in the contemplation of its promoters—our social order is old and strained, with many anomalies and weaknesses in it, and strong as is the element of conservation, there may come a pressure beyond its strength. But I cannot see that any Englishman who objects as we do to the whole bearing of his country's policy in this matter of Eastern or African States can bestir himself—I put aside all religious differences—when he is morally sure that no real abandonment of that policy is probable. The utterances of our public men seem to leave no doubt that there is substantial agreement in what may be termed the root of the matter between the party politicians on both sides. Why then excite ourselves about a change? To the disciples of our human Religion no portion of the troubles of Humanity can be alien, least of all that which concerns our own country; but when the accepted doctrines are such as to make our active intervention absolutely fruitless, we are justified in refusing to waste our energies.

I said that there was one exception in the case of strictly political questions. It is that of Ireland, which is again, after the expiry of a generation, face to face with distress of unquestioned magnitude; and apart from that distress, is again calling upon Great Britain to revise the existing relations between the two countries, the two points being further complicated by their close interdependence. The moral aspects of the Irish problem are what most concern us at present; they resolve themselves into the one question: What is the duty of the more powerful kingdom towards the weaker? We know how widely various would be the answers given. The Positivist answer would, I think, be in complete agreement with that which the nation would give, often over-hastily, in a similar case where there was no national interest

touched. It would be then to the effect, that the Irish nation should be allowed to revoke the assent—given, extorted, or bought—to the existing connection, and modify it as seemed good to it—establish, that is, Home Rule, if that seemed the best course, or repeal the Union, if that were deemed preferable; that the sole arbitrament lay in a reference to the interests of Ireland with no admixture of those of England. Such is the sense in which we can accept the formula of one of our politicians: Justice to Ireland, rejecting his qualifications, which deprive it of reality.

But here, as elsewhere, if violent remedies are avoided, only a moral change, a change in our whole mode of regarding such points, affords any hope. For the truth is, that the capital sources of our actual difficulties and prospective dangers in this Irish, as in our other external relations, must be looked for elsewhere than in any party or government. I suggest two sources for consideration. The first is the peculiar conviction which seems rooted in the English mind, that we can set all the world right, that we, and we only, are the true governors, competent to deal successfully with all the problems of Asiatic or African social existence. This conviction seems to have taken hold of us in a degree scarcely consistent with mental sanity; and no judgment from without, no failure from within, seems able to shake it. Historically, I believe it is one of the pernicious consequences of our successful intrusion of ourselves on India, and of our illusion as to the permanence and utility of that dominion. Certainly it is of comparatively recent growth; but whencesoever it comes, there it is. If we could but Anglicise the world all would be well. Are not the words of ancient wisdom but too applicable to us—‘A deceived heart hath turned him aside, that he cannot deliver his soul, nor say, Is there not a lie in my right hand?’

The second source is our excessive increase of population, that difficult and delicate question which meets us at every turn. On it I only touch here so far as regards its disturbing power without. It is at the bottom of that commercial hunger for new markets which but too frequently overbears all other considerations. It is at the bottom of that rapacious colonial expansion which cannot consent to take

others' claims into account, when they are in competition with the requirements of our colonists, not merely as to subsistence but as to wealth.

I add that the combination of these two impulses, which are amenable really to none but a religious treatment, has this evil effect amongst many, as amongst all this talk is apparently becoming visible, that it denies us that quiet which is so wanted for the wise settlement into the new order which all thinkers recognise as imminent.

I add further that it takes from us the disinterestedness and independence of conception which are requisite for our wise intervention in the general direction of the Western world, an intervention which no repugnance to the results actually attained should lead us to regard as other than a duty, bound upon us, if by nothing else, by the obligations contracted by our interference in the past. But there is much else to bind us, and it were greatly to be wished that we were so placed as to be able rightly to respond to this call. The trouble of the West is great, and the wholesome influence towards quieting its agitation, which under any true statesmanship our country might exercise, is not exerted; and in its absence the equilibrium of Europe remains most unstable. Our hands are tied by our own internal and external difficulties; and worse than that, all our political insight is perverted or dimmed.

Not that we are singular in this. Each of the great European States is, equally with us, debarred by its internal condition, in most cases by its exposure, from all but the most purely interested and national participation in the general concert. So completely is this so, that a general fact, which ought to be a matter of regret, is exalted to a theory, and to all appearance affords satisfaction to its upholders. The internal condition is such that in no case can the careful observer be without misgivings as to the permanence of the existing order. France, Italy, Spain, Germany—is not this true of each of them?

And if we pass out of Europe proper to the Eastern constituents of that geographical expression, disorganisation is no longer an anticipation but a reality, and a reality in growth rather than in decay. Internal disquiet is well nigh universal.

Turkey, Russia, and the new intermediate States, do they not justify my language?

In the international relations of Europe, however, one important change has been made in the last year on which I will briefly touch. I allude to the Austro-German alliance, which has been so loudly welcomed in this country. All such outward changes must occupy for us so subordinate a position, and are in the present condition of human affairs so easily reversed, that a more temperate judgment seems more in place. Still, it is an event of considerable importance, and we may see that there lie in it very great possibilities. If turned to right purpose by those who are immediately concerned in it, and wisely accepted by the other Powers of Europe, the alliance may be a great step to a sounder European order. If really guided by the spirit which should inspire the powerful organs of Humanity, those two great military monarchies might facilitate the peaceful transition of Europe through its difficulties in a degree which it would seem a dream almost to state. Strong in the sense of security derived from their close union, they might aid Italy by satisfying her substantially legitimate demands, whilst they left those which are for the time unreasonable to settle themselves; they might foster the peaceful development of the new communities formed to the East of them; and they might reconstitute, by their co-operation, a Poland of greater promise than the old. Unaggressive themselves, they might discourage all aggression on the part of others; and whilst by a quiet pressure they thus impose peace, they might watch in composure the action of those internal agencies in their own and other European countries, which are slowly moulding Europe to a different social organisation.

It can be no object for any of us with our belief to quarrel with the source from which indisputable advantages are derived. If the course of European history seemed to fix on other Powers as better qualified for the task undertaken by these Eastern empires, such other Powers failing we may well accept the substitute. But I am speaking of what is entirely problematical. I but submit for your thought the observations I have made. And we must not forget that the true work to be done, the most difficult part of that work, at

any rate, is of another kind. For us, and we are not alone—for all religious men—the work to be done in Europe is spiritual, not temporal. Outward order is but the condition of healthy spiritual advance, and it may be the most economical arrangement of the European forces that the task of upholding outward order should, in a preponderating extent, devolve on those who are certainly, by common confession and as a result of their past, not the best qualified for taking the first part in the spiritual renovation. It were to be desired, then, that some distribution of this kind should be generally acquiesced in, and that with due provision against any abuse of military power. Latin and Western Europe—I use the terms which are familiar—should devote itself to the right use of its peculiar strength. Any abuse of the kind I have indicated might be most effectually guarded against by that which still remains the most indispensable requisite for, as it is the greatest difficulty in, the establishment of a really firm European order; I mean by the close alliance of England and France, again with no tendency to aggression or exclusion, but as the basis for future unions, for the gradual welding of the whole West into one solid unity.

For the rest, that the European ferment is working towards some good result, that the greatness and duration of the convulsive struggles which usher in the new order are in correspondence with the surpassing value of that order when established, that the suffering attendant on a disunited, is giving force to the aspiration for an united, Humanity—these and similar conclusions we are ready to accept, we fully believe: if more than on others our faith forces on us interest in and sorrow for the suffering, it also gives us firmer support, a stronger, more rational hope, resting on the clearer insight it affords us into the nature of the evil. Confidence in the future of mankind is our inalienable possession. The present gloom should not unduly discourage us. It should but stimulate us to more activity in the creation and application of the remedy.

Our strength must lie in the due shaping of our efforts within the limited sphere in which it is given us to work, omitting nothing which can add force to them, but not over anxious as to the result. Gradually the sphere will enlarge—

it is in the nature of things that it should do so. Even now, perhaps, it is larger than we see—nor is what we see so limited as we at first imagine. A survey of the whole of our position would correct any inadequate first impression. The indirect action of the Philosophy and the Religion on the world in which they are circulating is allowed to be considerable; but it is not of that I wish to speak. I have rather in view the direct Positivist action in the most comprehensive sense of the term. In saying this I do not underrate the help derived from candid and thoughtful opponents, much less that given us by those who, without being Positivists, work on the same lines as it were, and move in the same direction as we. I take Professor Caird as an example of the former, Miss Bevington of the latter. It is useful to study the opposition, and it is encouraging from all points of view to see its changed tone. It is most useful to have support on such an important question as that of the existence and value of a morality independent of any theological sanction. Neither do I underrate the value to us of attacks of a very different kind which rest on unfairness and ridicule. They become increasingly useful as the system, as a whole, gathers way. The ridicule, for instance, which was a deterrent, and is often so even yet, is also often a stimulant. It is always a dangerous weapon, and it is peculiarly weak as against religious conviction. The foibles of mankind are its proper sphere, and even against them it is more amusing than effectual.

As regards direct Positivist action I wish to be as comprehensive as possible. We have perhaps been too little so in the past. It will be well perhaps if in the spirit of this great festival, the spirit of human unity, we take in, in our survey of Positivist action, all who in whatever degree claim that honourable name. It will then include all those, and they are numerous, whom we should not be wrong in describing as followers of M. Littré, as well as those who in various groups profess, in its full completeness, the discipleship of August Comte. There have been solid reasons why these two great divisions have stood apart; perhaps they may not for long altogether fuse, but there are indications of a change in this respect. Perhaps we shall find, or our successors

will find, that there has been side by side with much hindrance traceable to the Littréan school a considerable amount of preparatory work done by it. The very assertion of the name Positivism is a service of its kind as familiarising the European mind with the existence of a new doctrine. In any case it is certain that the progress of thought is leading some of those who have hitherto been content with this more negative aspect of the doctrine to inform themselves on it more positively, to examine the teachings of the disciple by the teachings of the master, and to pass from imperfect to complete assent, from philosophical to religious Positivism. The time seems coming, in short, when the Religion of Humanity will gather in many of the minds which have hitherto stood aloof from it, absorbed in contemplation of its scientific basis, but which have yet derived benefit from their preparatory condition. The process has been a roundabout one, but it comes in the end to the right conclusion. And those who have gone through it will have a special use of their own due to their previous connections. They will be able to forward the fusion of the two divisions by their knowledge of both.

The difficulty, however, in regard to them remains great, interwoven as it is with the facts of the history of our movement. But time is bearing us away from those facts and their influence, from the conflict they have engendered. If without weakness, in spite of certain considerations, we can recognise a faint underground of unity throughout, a growing unity in the present and the future, it may have a salutary bearing in the advance of our Religion. Few perhaps will have a stronger conviction of the need of that Religion than they who have lingered some time in the colder region outside, and have tested its unsatisfactory action on themselves.

There need be, there should be, no difficulty in an ample mutual recognition as between the different bodies or unities, for there are some who stand alone as units, which together constitute the second division, the believers in whatever degree in the Religion of Humanity. Full union may be unattainable, but its absence need not prevent the consciousness of an unity of purpose as well as an unity of belief. I

speaking, I am sure, the feelings of all members of our particular group, present or absent, when I say that, without any concealment of differences, their one great object is to forward the cause of our common religion and to regard as fellow-workers all who have that cause at heart. All useful work done, by whomsoever done, we shall recognise openly, whilst we persevere in the particular form of work which we think the most desirable. This attitude will be a great help, for by holding it we are enabled to spare ourselves labour. On the questions on which other Positivists speak or write we can afford to be silent, adopting their utterance as the expression of the community, if I may use the word. I have already acted on this in the earlier part of this address. There is so much to be done and the labourers are so few that economy is to be studied. From this point of view we may look with satisfaction on the doubling of our centre here in London, on the organisation of a systematic course, or of courses, of lectures expounding the doctrine. In fine, whilst we regret that we are not at one in our judgment any more than in the form of our action, we may avail ourselves to the utmost of such agreement as does exist.

Looking back on the year in its results for us who are here to-day, estimating very briefly and without any exaggeration our advance, there are one or two subjects of satisfaction. Our numbers have increased, however slow the rate of increase; our religious services have been kept up, with one interval only; our other meetings have been cordial. There is, I cannot doubt it, in most of us a greater activity perceptible—more readiness for all exertion.

Indications of this may be seen around us, in the temporary and permanent decorations of this room, on which I feel it a pleasure to say a word. We owe most of the pictures to the liberal conduct of Mr. Harrison. The valuable additions which so nearly complete the series in the early months are the contribution of an American friend, who has occasionally attended here, and has a considerable sympathy with us. Other gifts are coming in. M. Comte's tomb is now something that we can all realise by the sketch which is before us. The spirit in which others have worked and given deserves all recognition on my part. With a slight effort, all our roll

of worthies might be now completed. The library, too, is advancing to completion. There remains the one great want—music—hymns, and instrumental music. That, too, will come in time I suppose, but it seems long. This, however, is the only very real gap: and in all other respects we may rejoice in what has been done and is doing.

The particular points I will notice are: first, the increase of adhesion from the proletariat, above all from the most important of all the parts of that body, from the proletary women. This is the fact in the year's history which I record with the greatest pleasure. The difficulties used to seem so great that I had almost despaired of such a thing in my lifetime. It is, therefore, a peculiar satisfaction to see them disappear in even a few cases. Here as elsewhere too, the beginning is so much. Consequent on this step has been the introduction into the Church in the Sacrament of Presentation, of a proletary family—an example which I hope will bear fruit. In connection, again, with this movement, I would mention the special contribution to our cause of a Positivist tale, which many testimonies warrant me in regarding as likely to be most serviceable.

The other most noticeable fact is the extension of our action to another great centre of English industrial life, the formation of a Positivist nucleus in Liverpool. I do not mean the simple existence of one or more Positivists there, but the establishment of regular meetings, which will grow, having a real element of vitality in them, from the completely religious attitude of those around whom the movement naturally gathers. This is another very great step, and all the circumstances which attended it, the more they are examined, the more they show the decay of force in the opposition we have to encounter against us, the advance made by our religion, the preparation of the soil for its reception.

What more is there which those who are at a distance might wish to know? We have had several courses of lectures, but the attendance at them has been small. We shall continue them this year, for it is incumbent on us to do what we can, but at present it is not from them that we can gain much strength. Our whole experience hitherto has

been that lectures proper have not helped us. It is, perhaps, felt that a system such as ours, which claims to have in it the power of reorganising the whole frame of society, must begin by showing its competence in other ways than in mere teaching. Certain it is that, as our Founder saw, the advance which is at once most rapid and most stable is made by a direct appeal to the feelings of men. Hence I look with more hope to the various forms of social meeting which for both sexes have had a beginning this last year. After all, teaching proper is for the young; the reminder—the enforcement of the obligations which the teaching has established—is for the adult. Such are the two permanent institutions of the church under this aspect when established—the modes of action of its priesthood. They will rely, no doubt, for much of their efficacy on the series of ceremonies which are the sacraments of domestic worship, the importance of which, even in our present early stage, we have felt, all of us; and still more on the general prevalence of the habit of private prayer. But in the formation of the church, the gathering of new members—mainly adult members it must be understood—apart from the power of example—the influence of life and character as shown in action—social intercourse holds the first place; for in it the work of oral propagation—the superiority of which over reading I am every day led to feel, and which I therefore press on you all as the truest instrument at our disposal—this work finds the freest scope. Reading should be entirely subsidiary as a rule to thought and conversation.

I have confined myself to our own more immediate action. The circular affords me the opportunity of dealing with the larger whole. In the limits thus self-assigned, I have given my reasons for looking with some satisfaction on the year, as having been a real progress. I would wish to avoid any over-estimate—no one feels more acutely how slow our growth is—and I do not want to mislead anyone into thinking that it is as yet anything but extremely slow. I expect that it will continue so for some time: the next few years will try us all probably; drawing on our force of persistence, as we see that the course in which we persist, whilst it involves so much effort, seems to lead to so little result, and in consequence is

by some judged premature. Fully prepared to face this strain on our patience as I believe we are, it is wise not to overlook any just ground for encouragement, and such ground I have found in the quality of the last year's work.

There is another ground in the growing conviction that the most open putting forward of the Religion of Humanity, its direct preaching, is the true policy. I cannot be mistaken, I feel, on this. There have been too many independent signs of this growth of late to admit of any doubt. I am still speaking, remember, of our own special English body. I am not so confident as to a similar state of feeling in regard to our rudiments of a cultus, yet on that head too, allowing for differences of judgment as to this or that particular form—I have always considered the forms we have as tentative—with this allowance I say, I think that on the principle that our cultus should take some practical shape—should appear in act, and not in more or less remote prospect—our agreement is becoming more complete.

It should be so, I am sure. Nothing is essential, remember, but that we have meetings which are of a definitely religious character. Experience in our sectarian country shows us what a wide latitude such an expression allows; it would take in the Quaker and the Ritualist; and between these two, what a variety of assemblies, all succeeding in giving an impression of being religious. Our own increase of forms has been most cautious and gradual, and must continue so; but occasions will call for additions, and the want must be met.

I would gladly take all with me on this point, for in any case—with the most perfect assent that is—any new step is a great effort; and where I feel that there is considerable hesitation as to its desirability it becomes doubly oppressive, even if I have confidence that when taken it will shortly be accepted. In the twenty-five years which I have now spent in Positivist action, nothing has cost me so much as the slight initial steps in a liturgical direction. All is so old and yet so new, and the right combination of the two is such a problem. Less in degree, but still most sensible, is the pressure in regard to preaching, to direct religious utterances. For the administration of the Sacraments, there is greater help given

in the short but pregnant instructions left by our Master. No one can realise more fully than I do the advantage of following, not leading. If I dwell on the disadvantage of leading, it is not without a practical purpose. I have of late spoken more often and more freely on the duty of those who are disciples of our religion to make a habit of their attendance on our religious meetings. There are other valid reasons for this habit; but the one which I have just now uppermost is the support to which I feel I have a claim in what all must see is an arduous task. Each can help in lightening it.

We are all fellow-disciples, all followers of one Master, all fellow-believers in one religion—fellow-students, as a secondary point, of one doctrine. We are in a condition, that is, in which mutual help and counsel are the paramount want, by virtue of the particular period of our movement in which we are living. It is active communication, active concert, to which we should feel called, so evoking a general sense of life and energy. And this, I am bound to say, is evidently felt by most of us. It needs but steadiness—the high quality of perseverance in a word, which in our times is but too rare, from the conflict of opinions, and the absence of any clear insight into the relative value of the objects of pursuit—evils from which we need not suffer. Intellectual stay is supplied us in abundance. The impulse to use it should not be wanting to any believer in Humanity. The result of enduring persistence should spring naturally from the union of these two antecedents.

Where we are weak, it is the weakness of the impulse which is in fault, I suspect. We do not feel ourselves driven forward by any irresistible power on the path which our reason is fully persuaded we are right in choosing. We have a conviction, but it is languid and given to rest in itself. It is not strange that it should be so; the very greatness of the change which we see before us is alone enough to account for this passivity. And there is so much else. All around us is alien to vigour. Our attention is so called off, our intellect so frittered away, our sympathies so distracted. Children of anarchy, how should we be strong? It is much if our intellectual conclusions reject that anarchy and place

us in a state in which we lie open to the impact of some powerful and constraining motive.

When we are not weak to this extent we most of us probably feel that our impulse is not as strong as we wish it. Is it not that with all of us we are stronger in our turning away from our older beliefs than in our turning to our new? We are too much, perhaps, in the condition of Christian, when he had escaped from the City of Destruction but not entered within the gate. The love which our new service should rest on has not yet mastered us. We accept that service, and fully, but we accept it rather too coldly. It takes time, it takes thought, it takes a certain habit in regard to our conduct of life to work ourselves out of this coldness. This will be the general rule. There are cases where a sudden or very rapid possession of our being by the new impulse will be traceable; but at present they will be rare, and in view of the obstacles in our path it is well that they should be rare.

Convictions, feelings, habits—this is the threefold process of our complete conversion. We have long had the first, comparatively speaking, have contentedly acquiesced in the satisfaction they are charged with, and have not been over anxious to develop their consequences. Feelings—these are growing in some, in most I hope, but they have been as yet of unequal growth, are by nature, if unsupported, unstable, and by the slow action of our environment lose their first power. They want the sustaining force of habits—the habits, especially, of their deliberate and unintermitting cultivation. The stress then of the whole process is on habits. They are the capital, the decisive test of its perfect accomplishment, and to these we must, I fear, all of us feel and allow that we have not as yet paid sufficient attention. A change is visible even here; but it was high time that it should come. On the resolute formation of habits of devotion in the first place, of habits in conduct in the second, and on the equally resolute perseverance in them when formed, principally depends—it is our Master's judgment, not my own, which I am giving—the progress of our religion.

The world on which that religion is working, the disciples on whom it is working—these have been my general subjects.

How best to strengthen the disciples, so that they may most effectually act on the world, has been the underlying thought which connects the two.

We have no hesitation as to our object. In the prevalence of our Religion we see the salvation of the race, as we know that its adoption by ourselves has the promise of our own salvation; the promise I say, for we are alive to the imperfection which clings to our adoption. We are not yet wholly moulded into the new type. As so judging we would spread it in its full completeness to the utmost of our power. Worship, doctrine, and life—no part would we neglect, if we accord a certain precedence to the first. But all three imply, require, and rest upon something prior to them all—one central truth as the ground of their existence. All three look to Humanity. In her should centre our feelings; in her should we condense our knowledge; to her should we consecrate our life. The more we identify ourselves with her, the more we bring all the parts of our complex nature into close relation with her, the more apt shall we be for our task of enlarging her sway. It cannot be too often repeated that we are bound by the same conditions as our predecessors, that in principle our growth must be by the same means as theirs; that if we set forth a new object for the acceptance of all men, that object must hold the first place in all our preaching; that Catholicism and Islam as they are seen in their founders' conception are necessarily but our models in this method, their failure in no way depending on their method, but on their doctrine; that they were the first solutions, the rudimentary embodiments of the religion which is to absorb them and supersede them; that we return on them and learn from them; finally that they both agreed on this, the exclusive consecration of their efforts to the presentation to mankind of one all-absorbing existence—the source of all other life, the supreme end of all devotion.

For Humanity to take her place as such supreme end, we must, of course, believe that she is. This is really not difficult, and men are getting to see that it is not difficult. The absence of vagueness, the perfect reality of the elements which compose her, the simplicity of the earlier elementary notions with which, in mastering the conception, we come

into contact, rapidly removing the difficulty which at first seemed to beset her existence. On our last anniversary, I went at some length into certain trains of thought which might render the process easier. I have been lately led to approach the subject from another side. Our historical study brings before us, in mutual relation to one another, several distinct societies of men, each an independent constituent of the whole they collectively form. Each one of such independent national existences is to the families and individuals of which it is successively, or at any one time composed, to all intents and purposes a Humanity. Each member of a great historic nation looks back through the past centuries to the origin of that nation, traces its growth, dwells upon its unity, is intimately convinced of the reality of the existence he is contemplating, sees in it the ground and rule of his life and action. It is no abstraction to him; it is, in the strictest sense, a personality—a collective personality, on which his own personality rests—by virtue of which, in a word, he is what he is. Generation follows generation, but the people which they compose is not changed by their succession. It is still, as the case may be, Israel, or Greece, or Rome. But though independent in a sense, these several nations are not wholly so: their relation to others is a fact controlling their national independence. They are but co-existent collective persons, and each borrows from the other, and in an ever-increasing proportion, something which goes to augment its perfection. They still stand apart—as men stand apart—but they are sensible of a more comprehensive existence, of which they are but portions. Apply the reasoning which we have used for the one section to the collective personality formed by them all, and you will see that the whole in which they merge, and by virtue of which they come to be what they are, is, again, no abstraction, but a most real existence; and that whole is Humanity.

It is the comprehensiveness of this whole which daunts us. As some rise not above themselves, as some rise not above the family, as most, unfortunately, cannot rise above their country, so we all find it difficult to rise to Humanity. It is the barrier of individualism, so strengthened by all our previous associations and training, which precludes our rising.

It is not, then, in the domain of pure intellect, but in the mixed intellectual and moral difficulty that the obstacle is situated.

We will suppose it overcome ; and we are in presence of a new hindrance—the gap between our feelings and the conclusion of our intellect : a common and formidable impediment. It will take time to overcome it. But it need take no time to turn it. The service of others—for my present purpose, of our race—is not, fortunately, dependent for its claim upon us on our feelings consenting to it. It is an obligation which, in some form or other, is meeting with increased recognition. It has always been part of the NOBLE PATH, to borrow from an Eastern source. But it has always been, too, over closely connected with our individual nature ; it needs the social stamp more firmly impressed upon it ; it needs to be of direct, not of indirect application, to be given, that is, to Humanity in her own right, not because she is the creature of another power. To us, that other power is her creation ; and is at once set aside by her when known. But it has not hitherto been so thought ; and in the inversion, the necessary inversion, of the true relations, lies the explanation of the failure of the many beautiful religions of the Past.

The true relations once acknowledged, the Advent of Humanity accepted, a collective and social personality has taken the place of her individual personal representatives, and the whole character of our service feels the change with the clearness due to the removal of all interference between the worshipper and the being worshipped. He sees his service become one in kind and complete in rationality. We have perhaps taken that service upon us before, we take it now with all the satisfaction of a fuller assent. Its grounds, its limits its object, all gain in clearness ; no division is any longer sensible ; our duty to man is all in all. If we freely accept it and bend ourselves to discharge it, it will naturally react on our convictions and feelings, so that faith and love will gain vigour from action. It may not be so in some cases, such as the peculiar mental constitution which centuries of revolution have transmitted to us ; but in most it is probable that it will be so. When it is not, there the religion of duty, a noble form in itself, must take the place of that of Humanity, and

in the identity of result we must seek consolation for the discrepancy as to belief or sentiment.

I must leave much unsaid—much but imperfectly said. My aim is always, as you are aware, chiefly suggestion—a stimulus to your own meditation, that silent work which stands first in our estimate, and for that sufficient has been said. The cause we have in hand is worthy of all meditation. The evil is great, the remedy is single, if we press into the innermost heart of the problem. The remedy is in religion. I say not in ours necessarily. Let some other vindicate its claim. We here believe in ours, for we have felt the others fail us. As so believing, let us not be slow to draw out for ourselves its strength, its clearness, its beauty, its majesty; let us seek, that is, its full support, breathe its living breath, stir ourselves by past achievement to future action, justify our faith to man by its visible power over us, and hand over to others the noble heritage we have received, not impaired, but in due measure augmented. So shall we have lived up to the standard of our high calling.

THE ANNUAL ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE
POSITIVIST SCHOOL, 19 Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C.
on the Festival of Humanity 92 (1 January, 1880).

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

ANNUAL ADDRESS.*

On the Festival of Humanity, 93 (1 January, 1881.)

As usual, I begin with some of the political questions of the day which are of present interest to Englishmen, my circular enabling me to touch on the larger Western problems. I am aware both of the difficulty and objections which meet me in this course. But they are overweighed, in my judgment and at present, by the advantage. Apart from all considerations of the limited opportunities we have for speaking the practice places us at once at the social standpoint. Instances of the disorder which prevails remind us of the need there is of a new religion as a remedial power introducing a new order ; we have thus brought before us the one capital and paramount claim of our faith, that it is the instrument of reorganisation. The want must be felt, or the claim will gain no hearing.

It is, then, as English citizens that I address you at the outset, under all the anxiety that weighs on all who are worthy of that name in a time, as the present, of peculiar gravity. Yet on the main source of that anxiety I need not speak : my short pamphlet on Ireland exempts me. It is, I believe, a fair representative of English Positivism on that question. Any who have not seen it, and may wish to see it, will find copies at the bottom of the room. I may add that while each day changes, and generally for the worse, the immediate prospect, the permanent issue remains unaltered, becoming clearer as new complications arise. We can but wish, we can have little hope, that our nation and

* The commemorative form given on pp. 225, 226, applies also to this address.

its rulers may read aright the lessons of the past—they are written clearly enough—that they may with a tempered firmness control their own unwholesome aspirations, and in the interest of the future well-being of the two countries find the courage to break wholly with the tradition of unjust and uncompensated domination.

So unstable has been the political world that each of our anniversaries has brought its own peculiar uneasiness. Last year there was a general feeling, more deep-seated than I thought, that our then Government was more than usually responsible for the evils which we all acknowledged. We know within what narrow limits any particular set of ministers is responsible. But such was the feeling. A change has been made, but its results are not satisfactory, as yet at any rate. The great effort has ended so far in many directions in a continuance of the evils from which we had hoped to be set free, leaving a terrible stain on the reputation of our new governors and on the honour of the nation.

We have longed for, many of us looked for, the reparation of definite wrongs, and none has been made though much was promised. Some of those now in power loudly proclaimed that injustice had been done, and denounced its authors. Yet the authors remain unquestioned—I need not say unpunished—and the injustice we accept and profit by. The two African chiefs whose treatment is generally blamed remain in confinement, the one practically imprisoned in what is alternately a swamp and a desert, the other a closer prisoner; both equally in defiance of all right, both probably, one certainly, against all sound policy. The criminal instigator of the misfortunes of the Zulu king was dishonourably retained in his command till the outcry became too loud, and when recalled has no mark even of the displeasure of his superiors set upon him. And yet he has left us as a nation, not merely the disgrace above mentioned, but an inheritance of evil in this fresh violation of the dictates of prudence and justice, the war with the Basutos.

Again, were we not entitled to expect a reversal of the decision as to the Transvaal? Yet it was affirmed. Here I am happy to say some amount of retribution has come quickly, and I am told that there is an increasing conviction

that the retribution is merited. Will that conviction rise to action, to the demand that we acquiesce in our defeat and restore the country, as we are bound to do by our previous arrangements, to its legitimate owners? Legitimate, I mean, as against us. It has been well pointed out that we are not dealing with a revolt or rebels, but with free men who are defending their independence, torn from them by the high-handed act of one of our officials, in which act they have never acquiesced; and yet our actual Government is, it would seem, going to crush them.

We still wait for the fulfilment of our engagement to leave Afghanistan in the possession of its inhabitants. It is said that, however tardily, this will be done. Much evil might have been spared had it been done at once with a prompt decisiveness; the act will be greatly shorn of grace, but it will be welcome if it come. Till it is done, there is always danger of further mischief. In any case, no inquiry even is made as to where the guilt of the whole lies; neither civil nor military misconduct is to be investigated. All is hushed up in a general condonation.

On any European embarrassments I shall chiefly speak as they concern our English action; there is ample store of them. Calmness in regard to them, at all times so desirable, is now enforced. Our Irish difficulty must work powerfully to this end. With our small military resources, no statesman, whatever his bent, but must favour a quiet policy for Europe, and the immediate complications as well as the foreseen dangers may be more easily met in consequence of the moderation her discordant empire imposes upon England. She is thus, it would seem, perforce brought into accord with the calmer statesmanship of other European governments and with the peaceful aspirations of the French nation, which are exerting a wholesome control over any more ambitious tendencies. The hope I expressed that benefit might accrue to Europe from the Austro-German alliance has not hitherto been belied. All tends to give it solidity; most so the danger from the extension eastward and southward of the disturbing doctrine of nationalities, to the violation of definite State obligations, the previous basis of European order. If each race in turn is to receive satis-

faction of its vague longings, we seem far from any secure settlement. The restlessness of Greece is what I have more immediately in view, a restlessness unjustified by any proof of competence to turn to good account its satisfaction.

I have spoken in no party or violent spirit of the shortcomings of men from whom many hoped much, many still hope much. The weakness I have pointed out discourages hope, which I should be so glad to share. The tide of bitterness and national pride is rising strong: have our rulers strength to stem it? There is evil augury in the brutal expression of one at least of their subordinates, Mr. Grant Duff. Their position is most difficult, their power so uncertain. All blame for the men, even when most just, must be tempered by a due consideration of the influences at work upon them. Time will gradually draw into fuller light the evils of our electoral system as it bears on the enfeeblement of our public men, and of that painful mocking of profession by performance on which I have been commenting. The exaggeration of the candidate becomes the discredit of the member or the minister, and the policy which can arouse a strong feeling in an ill-informed electorate is found untenable in presence of the exigences of government. Add to this the unreality of the whole thing, in that the power nominally conferred has to reckon with long-established forces which its possessors generally recognise as legitimate, and is conferred for the purpose of an inroad on the established order to which those on whom it is conferred are bound by their deepest convictions, and lastly, is revocable on the shortest notice, and dependent on the caprice of the representatives or the represented. If our English statesmanship is at a low ebb, it is not to be wondered at under its actual conditions. Greatness implies some permanence, and each year seems to lessen the chance of our attaining any. The true hope lies in the pressure of difficulties. We cannot disguise from ourselves that our national burden is become very heavy, that the successful ambition of the past is taxing our capacity in the present, and pledging the resources of the future. Pressure is a main factor in human morality, for the State no less than for the individual, and for the present there is hope in this. We

may thus be saved from aggravations of the evil, whilst other and deeper forces, especially a more humane and human tone, are slowly directing opinion to a strong disapprobation and rejection of the dominant imperial temper. As yet, however, it is so entirely in the ascendant that we can only look to the teaching of suffering for producing the desired change in any appreciable amount.

Be this as it may, from a consideration of England alone and merely in respect of her dependencies there is good ground for our desire for a higher order, for some remedial doctrine. If we look closer at home, it is not otherwise; our state is one of unsettlement and division, and the most superficial observers may see that there is a growing acknowledgment that it is so, and that it is so not merely in commo party matters, where persistent disagreement is the theoretic basis of order; nor does it only extend to industrial relations where harmony, if not hoped for, is yet wished; nor in matters of opinion is it confined to the time-consecrated separation of Church and Dissent; or within the churches to such disagreements as have been considered compatible with outward unity; nor, lastly, as between belief in the prevailing doctrine and its rejection; but that there is something in existence which passes all these special and minor expressions—an intellectual instability and unrest which is undermining all convictions. For long years now this has been going on, but it is becoming more observable and is more observed. I will not say more about it further than this, that so far as it exists it is the certain condition and forerunner of a very deep social and religious change. The future belongs to those who can best answer its implied demand.

On a lower level, the commotion within the English Episcopal Church is worth a passing notice, if only to give expression to the feeling which I think we all have of regret for the measures which are thought necessary—which are, in fact, imposed by law—to secure uniformity, without any blame for those who are compelled to take them. The imprisonment of spiritual officers is not a pleasant sight, whatever their misinterpretation of their claims. Sooner or later, the disruption of the State Church seems inevitable, as

is her disestablishment. She has paid dearly for her connection with the State, and England has suffered with her, not to speak of the monarchy; but I do not think that there is any motive for us as Positivists to wish any hastening of an issue which is as reasonable as it is certain, and which may come too soon for a wise settlement. Any successful measure of reform from within—successful, I mean, in the sense of enabling the English Church to meet the forces which are bearing her power away—I think we may dismiss as futile; warranted in so doing by the fate of all such proposals in the past, if we needed any warrant distinct from our whole judgment on the end to which all our predecessors in religion are being irresistibly borne by the current of human thought.

Industrially, the year has been quiet in England, but the unity of the social tissue which the proletariat constitutes compels us not to forget that even this outward quiet has not been attained elsewhere. Contrast the two congresses of Dublin and Havre, and it will be seen that in France the chasm between the classes is not filled up; there are occasional indications of great danger from its continuing open. In Germany it is the same. Nowhere in the West, in fact, is there reason to think that the quiet is more than on the surface. Given the existing moral condition and social aspirations of the two antagonistic industrial powers, and it is impossible that it should be. It is now, as ever, the same problem: all improvements on the method of solving it are most welcome, such as the substitution of temperate discussion for violence, but the ultimate solution is different from any method and must come from a new conception of industry as a whole, and from a great moral change in the parties to the struggle, with a change in their respective attitudes as a consequence. The industrial importance of England is such, that the action of her industrial classes, if wisely directed, might modify most beneficially the whole situation of the West. In this connection I refer with pleasure to the address of Dr. Ingram to the Congress at Dublin, which most of you have seen.

On the Positivist action of the year I wish to speak, as I have generally spoken, in the spirit of the largest com-

prehension. The more I do so the more I am sure shall I be in agreement with you and all with whom we are more immediately connected in France or elsewhere. The division I acknowledged last year—that of the complete disciples of Auguste Comte, and his disciples through M. Littré, if the expression be allowable—this division I still acknowledge. And I adhere to what I then said in respectful admission of the service of the last-named, or Littrean group. I see nothing to weaken—rather the contrary—the conclusion to which I had come, that there is an increasing tendency on its part to recognise the need of a more constructive organic policy as the completion of the philosophical conception, an increasing sense that a method is not a final achievement. There remain and will remain differences, which may or may not disappear later, under the teaching of events, under the inherent power of the doctrine when logically put forth, and perhaps from a better mutual understanding as to the objects we aim at and the way in which we pursue them. More personal contact might be useful in this respect.

All believers in the Religion of Humanity may see that they have a community of purpose, if there are, as of old 'diversities of operation,' and all equally may ask themselves, as they seek to further it, how far such common purpose implies the adoption of similar means. Such believers have come to their belief under the most diverse influences, and it is but natural that, at the outset, there should be great divergence as to means. We must accept this. Each day makes clearer the necessity for the freest acceptance of it, if we would have solid and peaceful advance. We are exposed to manifold dangers arising from differences due to a different milieu, different antecedents, and to the want of the requisite freedom of intercommunication in the absence of a common language. Freedom of action, energy, and reciprocal toleration are the conditions of success at present. The first we have regained, not without cost; the second depends on ourselves; the toleration we can give, if we cannot secure its reciprocity. Without any fruitless efforts at reunion, the course of things here, as in France, is bearing us onward to this desired result, as the almost inevitable consequence of freedom and energy. We may wait quietly

for their effect, which will be aided by the force of outside opinion in proportion as we become better known and more recognised, meaning by we the whole body of the more complete Positivists without distinction of groups.

We have seen lately, on more than one occasion, that we are becoming more known, our aim and scope more fully understood. The full quarter of a century has now elapsed since the foundation of our Religion, and the period cannot be termed barren of result. There are but few here, I believe only two, whose memory carries them back over the whole of that time, with cognisance of its trial of faith and expectation. But all can see that the special strain of almost entire isolation has been notably lessened, and that it is a body which now fronts the future. Small and not without divisions as that body, integrally considered, is, it yet commands recognition from without, as distinct, I mean, from the recognition of the doctrine which it teaches. I will not dwell on the evidences of this, on the change of tone towards us in responsible as well as irresponsible, organs of opinion, in the anonymous press as in the pulpit and Church congress; or again, in France, in the press, and in the responsible utterances of a man in the position of M. Gambetta. The importance of his language has not escaped observers, perhaps has been overrated, but we may accept it as most useful.

Speaking then of the whole body, our retrospect of its efforts may in most general terms be favourable. There has been a real activity on the part of all. Both in Paris and in London the two centres are steadily at work, and in much to good purpose. Shortcomings and difficulties we have and shall have, but there is a balance of good attainment, and we are gaining impetus as we move. I speak quite in the general, and knowing that you will supply the deductions from any over-estimate, whether as regards our own more immediate group or others. The crisis through which we have passed has shown our strength, if it has shown our weakness. It has shown, that is, that our power as regards the world outside grows in the face of division. It has shown also that no division extends below the surface of personalities, that the doctrine remains unaffected; that the

question is still how or when the religion is best presented, not whether it shall be presented. If I touch on the weakness it has shown, I would not wish to be understood as declining my share in it. Morally, it has been or should have been of the greatest use, as throwing us, the divided disciples of our Master, back on ourselves and making us understand our position. What there has been impure in motive, bitter in feeling, deficient in our intellectual grasp, or in our practical exertion, we may usefully draw out by its light, and gain strength by its admission and avoidance.

I can be more particular when I turn to our own proper action. We have advanced, there is no question. The room in which we are shows it. All who are here for the first time since its re-opening in September must be sensible of the change effected for comfort and for beauty, whilst its character as a whole remains the same, and in its marked peculiarity contrasts with all other places of worship. In his absence, which we all regret, I may speak in just admiration of the service rendered us by Mr. Middleton. It is but just also to pay a tribute to the liberality and the labour which have enhanced the permanent decoration by these pretty temporary ornaments. All has been done or given in honour of Humanity, and in her name I accept the offering. The room is attached by the inscription on the board outside to the Church of Humanity, and so takes its rank as the first public building openly dedicated anywhere to her worship. At the same time it keeps its continuity by the second part of that inscription. It must serve all the purposes which our present work demands that it should. But it was an important step in advance to give it, as the first of those purposes, a direct religious consecration. And it may not be without interest to observe, when we think of the slowness of our movement, that it was not till about the middle of the third century of Christianity's existence that her congregations could meet in a building—a public building devoted to their use, a Christian church or temple. May the omen be propitious.

Certain of our wants are still unsatisfied. Neither the portraits nor the library are yet complete. The deficiency of music has been met. The organ which a friend offered me

in the summer is inaugurated on this festival, and henceforth our services will have a fuller religious character, more in consonance with the religious tradition of our country. This I have long desired and am very grateful for. Instrumental music must, as we are at present, be all that will be prudent. It will lead on, doubtless, but we must advance with great caution. The completeness of social spirit which should characterise our movement will gradually surmount all difficulties.

From the room I pass to its use. With the exception of the time of repair, the Sunday meetings have been continued throughout the year, with the aid kindly given by others. I have not used the word service, for there were a few weeks in September when we adopted what may be found an useful practice and met only for some reading and such remarks as it might suggest, thus easing the strain which the maintenance of the fuller services occasionally involves. For such less formal assemblings it will be a great advantage that we have music.

Our social meetings have also continued. There have been five during the year, and they have been successful. Due notice will be given of those for the current year, when they are fixed. The improvement in the room is a great gain in regard to them. It is now fully qualified for reception.

Most important of all acts in this room are the social sacraments—most important as a matter of experience at the present stage of our existence, this great Festival alone competing with them. With such small numbers, their administration must be rare. Presentation, Admission, and Destination, these have been the sacraments of this year. The two instances of the former I have spoken of at other times. The Admission and Destination took place here. There was also at the same time as the former a semi-sacrament, a subsidiary ceremony of reception, the acceptance and acknowledgment of membership when from circumstances the full ceremonies were inadmissible. This may be useful as a purely transitional institution. This is the portion of the year's work which I look back on with the greatest pleasure. Nothing can give a greater reality to

what we do here than this free acceptance, in the face of all deterrents, by the children or servants of Humanity, with full deliberation, of the obligations her sacraments impose. The recipients and those in whose presence they received them were, I think, impressed with the force of the institution.

Out of the sacramental institution there has grown increased activity in another direction. I was dwelling last night on the value we set on the adhesion of women, and the necessity of so presenting our religion as to gain their sympathies. The sacraments have a singular power in this respect. Hence, as a direct consequence of the presentation I mentioned last year, came meetings of women once a month, the beginning of a movement which may grow. Nor is this the only form. I well remember, in the early years of what I may call our desert life as a community, that it was a constant saying: 'What you urge may do for men, but never for women.' Well, women came, one and then a second, and with years they have grown to a number. It is no uncommon thing to see a third of the congregation women, sometimes even a larger proportion. I count with confidence on a steady advance as we proceed. The difficulty was to make a beginning. All honour to those who had the courage required.

Last year I noticed the formation, under a religious impulse, of a new centre in Liverpool. The movement has proceeded with a quiet determination, developing itself freely in such form as has been thought suitable, and introducing such æsthetic accompaniments as the steady devotion of its members could supply. They have vocal as well as instrumental music, and the reproduction, in another form, of the busts which line our walls will give—perhaps gives to-day, for they meet this evening socially—visible expression to the historical spirit and the worship of the Dead which are essential features in our Religion. It is a pleasant connection which is thus established between the two rooms. Besides the Sunday meetings, they have, as we have here, subsidiary meetings in the week, and both sexes contribute their several support to the cause.

In the autumn I was asked to lecture in Birmingham with an eye to some similar consequence. The experiment

was not discouraging. There was a large attendance at the lecture, and a small but pleasant meeting on the following Sunday for reading and conversation—all that is yet feasible—has been followed by like ones on the Sundays since. There as everywhere the disciples of our faith will need great force of persistence in the face of obstacles, especially against the depression attendant on slow progress. Each of our large towns has its own peculiar mental and social atmosphere, and therefore its special difficulties and requirements. But in all I am convinced, in fact wherever there is a large population congregated in Western Europe, there is much latent Positivism. There is a harvest ready for the zealous and enduring worker. And the greater notice accorded us is a powerful aid to our being heard. Two or three resolute adherents, especially if they bring the element of the family to bear, may, I feel confident, in any such centre as Birmingham, in a few years of quiet effort, form the nucleus on which all depends. It is a long and laborious ascent that has to be breasted, the palace Beautiful is still at the top of the hill Difficulty, but each advance of older centres, as each new formation, gives encouragement and ease. It is for this reason that our chief work must be as yet in the strengthening the existing bodies and adding new ones, adjourning, not forgetting, some other considerations. We must grow into a real social force as the first necessity. By this I mean we must grow into something that has to be reckoned with, which comes under men's observation as a fact with which they have to deal, a something which enforces attention by its life and movements—by its manifesting, that is, a capacity for growth and development. That in some mysterious way we have such capacity is not, I think, now doubted by some of those who most sneer at the smallness of our numbers.

From what I learnt but yesterday, the hope arises that in Manchester we may reasonably count on some movement, as there are three or four Positivists there.

The last point in the history of the past year which I shall treat is our action in Paris, again chiefly as it concerns us. Attaching as we all do the greatest importance to our union with the Positivists in France, abhorrent as we all

are to any idea of a so-called national Church, as generally of nationalism, it has been an object to constitute for our group a recognised centre in Paris. For this purpose we have put at the disposal of Dr. Audiffrent a comfortable apartment in all ways adequate to its object. I inaugurated it during my visit in June last, with a full explanation of the uses which in due time we wished it to subserve. With the very complete reciprocal freedom which characterises the group, our Parisian brethren will weigh well the means they must take to attain their end, the propagation of our Religion in its fulness. And if there is some difference of opinion as to those means, we must wait for the enlightening influence of time, to show on which side the correct judgment lies. That there are difficulties I will not conceal. I have never known the time when there were not, but, combined with the most entire independence, I look forward to a sufficient concert and to a consequent strengthening of our cause.

193
415

It is twenty-one years since, to a congregation compared to which the one before me seems very large, I said that in its temperate advance the Religion of Humanity would gradually develop, to meet its wants, adequate liturgical forms. If I recall the words, it is to show how very temperate has been the advance, over-cautious perhaps, in the direction of a liturgy, such as may suffice for our provisional wants. Something has been done, however. The first public or joint invocation of Humanity in a set form of prayer was a great step: a step, it should be remembered, which has the full sanction of Auguste Comte. I say this, because to some, direct prayer to Humanity is a stone of offence. And I so far would put myself right with them by reminding them that, as a disciple of Comte—and it is as an obedient and devoted disciple that I have ever stood forward, whatever the functions forced on me by the exigences of our peculiar condition—I am warranted in this practice to which most of us have given from their hearts assent. I refer them to M. Lonchamp's *Essai sur la Prière* of which our Master spoke so highly. The short service which embodied this practice was placed in your hands two years ago. In an enlarged form, and with some occasional prayers added, it is again with you. As so altered it marks a progress, is a more

assured assertion at once of the need of some forms to direct our common worship, and of our persistence in the special form of direct recognition of the Power we serve. For this enough has been done; under all other respects we are still among the weak beginnings.

In form and expression I have kept close to the impressions of earlier times, to the traditions of the Church of England. If there is any good in them, it will be said to be borrowed. I have no wish to deny the charge. I have sought to do what that Church did so wisely at the time when she separated from Rome: she retained what she considered valuable in the older system. I would do the same, under the necessity, however, of making greater changes. We turn in this, as in other matters, with a firm decision from the conclusions of our predecessors, Roman Catholic or Protestant; but we so turn with respectful gratitude, and we freely resort to their spiritual accumulations and seek guidance from their methods. It is of the very essence of our most historical Religion that it should incorporate all it can of the teachings of earlier faiths.

To obviate mistakes, let me remind you that the future worship of Humanity, her public worship, is very different from what we do here as useful for the present. We may be normal in our private prayer, normal in our sacraments, and in the domestic worship of which they are a part, but we can be only partially normal as regards the public cultus. I make, as you will make, all allowance for inadequacy of execution in regard to all three, and speak only of the essential principles. How far within such limits am I right as to the last of the three? This festival is normal in idea; it will gather fulness and grandeur with time; but in its actual simplicity it carries in it all the germs of its utmost growth, it is the sapling which will be the tree. So the festivals of yesterday and the day before were normal, inalienable portions of the definitive cultus, endued with complete vitality, if in the obscurest germ. Lastly, the commemoration of our Master's death is a possession for all time. But our ordinary services are on a lower level. The condition for the complete public worship was the existence of a sufficient body living in the practice of personal prayer:

a condition as yet but imperfectly fulfilled. Our worship here might be well described as having a twofold object in direct relation with this condition—it is Auguste Comte's—as aiming in the first place at furthering its fulfilment; as aiming secondly at the implanting a sense of longing for the higher form of the Future. This point is of considerable importance. A right estimate of what we are doing here and its objects is comparatively rare, and as we proceed you will see that we should exert ourselves to promote it.

In the survey of our immediate past I have spoken as one who is on the whole satisfied. You know, most of you, how moderate we have to be in our desires. Many see clearly enough, even too clearly, the drawbacks which must be allowed. I cannot but feel that the general spirit is right, and we must look to its influence to secure us from the dangers which exist. The chief one lies in our Protestant antecedents, in the mental dispositions which they have fostered. I instance the readiness with which each one of us will pronounce at first sight, and without any thought, on the decisions arrived at by patient genius after long meditation. Within and without, this unconscious arrogance, which is the child of the right of private judgment, is a constant source of wonder when I see it in others, of annoyance when I am conscious of it in myself. Its easiest corrective is one long ago suggested, of a positive character. Substitute here too duty for right, and we shall in most cases be slower in our conclusions, oftener disposed to acquiesce in those of others. A better corrective still would be a just veneration for our great Master.

In all that I have said on our action, I have been thinking of the absent as well as, if not more than, of the present, and this must be my excuse for anything that may be already familiar to some. So last year I spoke for those at a distance. And the information I have given is tolerably complete. But I cannot forget that it has been a terrible year to some of us, early and late death having been busy: to all Positivists a year of heavy losses. I cannot forget that I do not speak to the same body; I cannot forget that the chief and noblest of the absent—none will quarrel with the term, it is the highest tribute to his memory that it is so—one who

was ever more especially present to my thoughts in all I did and said—has been struck down, and that all the life and interest he added to our work is withdrawn. We work on, for the cause he and we had at heart is above all private sorrow, and we may not derogate from the spirit which bound us together in life. Nay, our work, brought daily into connection with his memory, and as it were into his presence, must not lose in its efficiency and its purity by the separation of death; but there is a void, and the future admits rather of endurance than of the brighter hopes which once lay in it. Endurance, no doubt, is strong, but it cannot still the aching; and the beautiful communion which raises and strengthens may draw sweetness out of the suffering—but it is still suffering.

Work whilst it is called to-day, for the night cometh when no man can work. So speaks a chief apostle to his successors in the apostolate throughout the ages; and the priest accepts and enforces the lesson, and all, each in his place, are I believe ready for it.

Such is human life that, if we would be real, no festival can be without its side of grief, for death is the condition of Humanity's growth. Most close, therefore, is the connection between to-day and the commemoration of all the dead, held on Thursday evening. That of last night, was a completing the conceptions of the whole cultus of the past year, and a fitting introduction to our present celebration. As honouring one of the most beautiful agencies in the service of Humanity, death was not absent there, but the sense of life and activity prevailed. It must be paramount to-day in our homage to Humanity.

It is well to speak of our social interests; it is necessary to explain to the absent, and in some cases to the present, the state of our cause, what is being done by those whom language connects more intimately with them. But neither the one nor the other can be our main subject. That must be larger, more catholic, more religious, more directly relative to the Power under whose invocation we meet. We enter to-day, I remind you, on the second quarter of a century in her recognised existence, and our previous efforts, as well as our actual circumstances, warrant our obeying the logic

of that invocation, the logic of the consecration of this building. We linger no longer among the elements, we pass to the complete and central conclusion which they are meant to establish. Believers in Humanity, living and wishing to live still more in communion with her, moved, however imperfectly, by a sincere love for her, set apart for her service by our own voluntary act, it is our duty to proclaim her in all her reality, all her majesty. As she substitutes herself for the Gods or the God whom she created as her provisional representatives, she claims the undivided allegiance of her servants. Her claims to power are smaller than those advanced by some among those representatives, but they have a real foundation, and so are infinitely stronger. So, too, of her will. Men have invoked, invoke almost daily, the will of God as the sanction of their own imperfect, often evil determinations, and in perfect good faith think of this will as something really existing independently of them. The will of Humanity, as expressed by her past, does exist independently, and imposes itself on the most resistant. They obey it unconsciously, as they have ever obeyed it; with increase of wisdom they will give a conscious and willing submission. There is no other change open to them. I am stating no new doctrine, I am but bringing out into fuller relief that which we hold, drawing out the consequences of the language we familiarly employ. What is the government of the dead, which we all have learnt to acknowledge as irresistible and indispensable, however much this or that generation may seek to shirk it, but the will of Humanity and her power, under one of her two great aspects? The degree of obedience each generation gives, and so the degree of nobleness it infuses into its service, that I repeat is the only allowable difference. It must give its service, for it is a portion of the movement, and the communication of the impulse must pass through it. Here again we may easily trace the connection of to-day with the two preceding festivals.

If in aught, in language or in action, we are bolder than we have been hitherto, it is not without justification. We cannot take what is called in common language a new departure, in the strict sense: the creative genius of our

Founder precludes it. But for ourselves we may do something of the kind; we may drop, wherever it remains, the attitude of timidity or hesitation and assert to the full our convictions and our purpose. What should hinder us? Not the strength of the opposing forces. Long ago, as individuals measure time, we were told by Auguste Comte, that if we did not make way the fault lay not in the surroundings but in ourselves, that there was no power of resistance dormant in the decaying social order. We have not listened to his voice; we may take shame to ourselves that we have not; but as we now listen to it, and follow it, we shall see that he spoke rightly, and that the weakness he detected has not developed into strength in the interval between us and him. It is not merely that there is disorder; there has often been disorder, which has issued as the present will do in a more persistent order. The outer disturbance is but the symptom, a graver symptom by the force of its amount; it is the powerlessness to remedy it which is haunting all those who are by position charged with the task which constitutes the real essence of the malady.

Press into the inner heart of the matter, judge what is passing around you with the spiritual eye—as men, that is, of a deep religious conviction—and you will, I think, come to this result, that if we have many enemies, we have but one really formidable competitor or opponent, and that is the Religion of the Past, which may for practical purposes be condensed into Roman Catholicism. Rome alone offers a valid substitute. I am speaking, you will see, of our Western world, on whose decision all turns. In it all forms of theological belief will stand or fall as a social power with the belief of the middle ages. Possibly that belief may be modified in presence of the common danger, so as to lead to that reuniting of Christendom which so many devout minds are longing for; or the result may be arrived at differently, by the chief Protestant Churches following the example of many of their noblest members and craving readmission into the Church from which they separated, under the same pressure as that to which the individuals yielded—the pressure of what they would call infidelity, but which, if it were infidelity, would have no power over them. It is the

higher, more comprehensive, more satisfactory belief which is the real menace, and which as yet most of them, in good faith often, I believe, confound with the negativism from which they wisely revolt.

However this may be, the Religion of the past is our real competitor. Besides it there is nothing in the field. Society, which is really alien though conforming, has been justly said to be honeycombed with unbelief—I quote an English bishop's opinion—and unbelief cannot be its permanent condition. And beyond the limits of what is called society there is instinctive clinging to the inherited faith, or there is an abandonment of it which is not the less complete because it is a barely conscious process. From the spiritual side then, we may well be bold, for as an organic power, a Church organisation controlling the minds and actions of men, it is not easy for us to doubt that Roman Catholicism is on the wane. And were it not so, we should still be bold, a new Church may not grow otherwise—ours as little as any. Her lofty pretensions must be put forward with a corresponding plainness and energy; the most daring in conception amongst us are not sufficiently aware of the inherent power there is in them, not sufficiently alive to the majestic march of our Religion, to the rapidity with which Humanity is moving on her course towards her visible installation. The after-time will see this; we may with good reason presume it.

I add that the same language holds good if we look at what is passing around us under its more worldly aspect. There again is no strength of opposition to the political or social system we offer. We may press forward without hesitation in such ways as are open to us, if we are faithful to our doctrines. The various established governmental forces are all weakened from their self-distrust as much as by the revolutionary impact. The revolution is in fact within them as much as without, and their trust is in force. This state, however, as a consequence of the spiritual disorganisation, I may leave with the merest mention.

If I reduce the real opposition to us into such a narrow compass, what is to be said of the positive forces in our favour? I am, as you will see, convinced that all is making

for us, that from all quarters come feeders to the main stream of our progress. The morality, the industry, the religious feeling of mankind are all taking a human colouring, all modified, that is, by the influence of advancing Humanity. The coherent and comprehensive doctrine which reveals her to mankind will be able to turn to account each distinct contribution.

Under no illusion then as to our own immediate success—our disposition is not towards such illusions, which a rough experience has little encouraged—we may yet feel that the same experience warrants confidence and boldness in action. The great question is, what direction it should take. It is scarcely an open question. By the teachings of Comte, by the observation of the religious power we confront, we are equally guided to one answer. It is a systematic worship of Humanity that we have to place before the world, in distinct contrast to the systematic worship of the theological faith. Herein has lain the power of that faith for organisation; herein must lie our power of reorganisation. This is the supreme end to which all our efforts tend. On our way we take in all minor issues.

The end given, we may ask ourselves how we can forward it, each in our sphere. The work we do here collectively, small in its dimensions as it is, the rudimentary stage of a cultus to be developed, has yet its value as a type of concentration of energy and a symbol of the future. So far as we aid in the furtherance of this work, we are useful. But it can only be a part of our contribution. Each again helps in proportion to the steadiness and depth of his conviction, which may be strengthened and secured by knowledge, but which does not require much knowledge for its formation and growth. There is truth in the language so much insisted on by Protestant divines—*fides est fiducia*—faith is confidence; faith in the saving sense, and not in the sense of intellectual belief; for with us, as with our predecessors, the word has two significations, and, in the higher of the two, faith is eminently contagious, is a subtle but powerful influence going out to others from him in whom it is strong.

The same may be said of hope. A centre of hopefulness

here and there a man may be, and by being give strength to others. In a high degree hope is rarer perhaps than faith. Hopeful comes in after Faithful. Our times do not encourage it, and in regard to ourselves our slow progress has lessened it in most of us. The weakness of the feeling is an evil, especially for the young: we may be on our guard against this evil, and against a certain disposition to the affectation of it, which is encouraged by the tone of all around us.

Again we may help by knowledge, rightly used. Those who can should spare no labour in its acquisition, still less in its digestion, in the preparation of it, so that they may be skilful in its communication; and the largest part in such skill is sympathy, as the most important factor in the digestion is meditation.

I do but indicate certain ways in one or other of which all may help, in all of which some. There still remains the highest way—the assistance given by a devoted life; and this again is open to all, and all may see that it is the highest gift each can give. We may give of our gold, our frankincense, our myrrh, but the gift of ourselves includes all, and is higher than all. Let us learn from our Christian opponents, as we see them in this country—I use the term without any wish to dwell on the opposition. As the dogmatic system of Christianity gives way, and opinion settles into unorthodox forms, what is it on which all alike, both those who would uphold the dogmas, and those who are more in the stream—what is it on which they are falling back? It is a life. We can hardly discuss that life with them—little coming of a discussion on which we enter with so much ambiguity not cleared up, especially the all-important question, what he was who led that life, and, consequently, in what language we may speak of him. Therefore we have only to do with the fact that they feel that there is in a right and beautiful life more power than in aught else. And they are so far completely right, and their teaching is as good for us as for them. I was speaking last night of saintly women. I have, or others have, spoken throughout the year of noble—at times saintly men. We are, therefore, not strangers to the power of a great example.

They do but condense into one what we gather from many. But they insist on it more, perhaps, than we are wont to do, and it is to this difference that I wish to call your attention. We shall do little till we are equal with them in this respect, and at least equal to them in the application of the lesson. A life led in growing accordance with our large and most noble faith, such is the gift the service of Humanity would most gain by, and such a gift we all can give. It is a power beyond all other powers, and its value is being more and more recognised as human morality advances.

It is a power which we might have had in a greater measure, but of which we have been deprived by circumstances. The Religion of Humanity began in Philosophy, and was a superstructure on Politics, and this highly intellectual development has operated prejudicially upon its acceptance. We have to correct this by an inversion of the process, by placing it at once in its due supremacy, and proclaiming Humanity in her simplest unity, to bring all into her allegiance, to enlist all our feelings in her service. One aid to this we have been unfortunate in missing. He who revealed her, he who lived in her and for her, he who would have been her best preacher, Auguste Comte—I feel it every day—remains practically unknown on all the more religious side of his life. Had he lived, all his life would have been devoted to the work of setting forth the Religion. In his death he hoped that there would be a compensation in the fuller understanding of his effort. It has not been so, and hence a great delay for us. How long the gap will be left unfilled I cannot say, but as my experience grows, there grows with it my regret for this obstacle. If we could all feel this regret it would be in a degree diminished, for we should all seek for further knowledge of the personal history of our Master.

That his birthplace, his tomb, and now the room in which he died are before us, is a step in the right direction; but we want more, the knowledge of the spiritual man whose existence consecrates to us those memorials. His will, his prayers, his confessions, his correspondence with Clotilde de Vaux, these are still wanting, and in them is much of his spiritual existence. We can but imperfectly

supply the want from his works. It should become clear to us that the philosophical and political thinker had merged in the saint; that the life of thought was so fruitful of good because it was a life of prayer; that if he preached sacrifice to others, no man ever lived who imposed it more completely on himself; that if he preached Humanity to others, he had been the first to give her all, to consecrate every faculty and power to her service; that if he made love his watchword, it was because he was the most loving of men. In a word, on us, too, there should rest the memory of a life belonging to our more intimate history with all its enkindling influences: a life, which in the power of its enduring abnegation might make us feel what an inspiration there must have been in the Being he proclaimed, by its depth of Religion bear us away with it into warmth of religious feeling, give us the enthusiasm we are lacking, and transmute our intellectual assent into communion with Humanity.

CHURCH OF HUMANITY (POSITIVIST SCHOOL),

19 Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C.

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

ANNUAL ADDRESS.*

On the Festival of Humanity, 94 (1 January, 1882).

The social nature of our Faith, its completeness, its claim to give direction, its exclusion of all but strictly human considerations, all combine to justify the attention which we give to the great practical questions which are under discussion around us. We acknowledge their difficulty, their complexity, but we cannot accept the common judgment, based on the peculiar antecedents of our country, the judgment which disapproves the admixture of religion with politics. We admit the duty of thought and study, so that we may not speak without having done all in our power to make ourselves competent; we admit the duty of bringing the most dispassionate spirit to our social and political investigations; we concede that at all times, and on occasions such as this more especially, we should avoid all personal, all mere party issues, and that by approaching such subjects from the moral side we should place ourselves in closest connection with the truer religious feelings of the past. But we can go no farther, for we seek to blend religion and life as they have been blended in other faiths, but are not blended in that in which we were trained. We cannot acquiesce in the distinction between them which is general around us; with the object we have in view we can allow no part of human life to be alien to our religious teaching.

The one great principle on which we deal with politics, the making them dependent on morals, enables us to simplify our discussion of them by looking at them from one common standpoint, that of our duties. The mutual action of nations, equally with that of classes and individuals, is to be brought

* The commemorative form given on pp. 225, 226, applies also to this address.

to this standard. Its practical application must be left to those on whom it naturally devolves, but our endeavour is so to influence opinion as that it may secure the adoption of the method.

In a certain degree the past year has witnessed its adoption; and though we may think the advance has been but partial and imperfect, we are none the less bound to pay the honour due to those who have made it.

Looking thus at the political world in the largest sense, international, that is, as well as national, the numerous difficulties in which we are involved may be touched on without any detail. The grave anxiety which Ireland has caused during the past throws its shadow over the coming year. That which would most tend to expel it would be—on the part of our Government, the prevalence of the spirit recommended by Lord Hartington, an inexhaustible patience drawn from the retrospect of the past relations of the two countries—on the part of our nation, a more respectful and sympathetic bearing. The acuteness of the crisis is a ground of hope, as it enforces a more thorough sifting of the whole problem, the solution of which depends more on moral than on political considerations—more, that is, on the disposition which both sides bring to it, than on any mere political argument.

All Positivists will gratefully welcome the recognition by our Government of duty as opposed to the commoner instincts of interest or ambition, of a higher sense of national honour as opposed to the lower which has been but too dominant. In South Africa, there remains much to be done for reparation of confessed wrong. Even in the Transvaal, the retractation has been incomplete; the unconditional return to the state of things which preceded the error of annexation, an error frankly acknowledged, would have been more just, not more irritating at home, and less fraught with complications. Still, much has been done; and we may hope that what remains unrepaired will be approached in the same spirit.

In Afghanistan there has been even a more complete reversal of an erroneous policy, an unreserved withdrawal from an unjust aggression.

Such concessions are extremely difficult under the moral state at present existing. We may reasonably hope that we are advancing to a higher. They are in themselves evidences of that advance, the consciousness of which enabled our statesmen to make them. But the language and temper which they have evoked should dispose all to accept the promise which is in them rather than cavil at any inadequacy. Still, we must press forward, for the demand for further movement in the same direction is gaining force. With an empire acquired and constituted as ours is, there is no halting on the path of revision. Fortunately interest and morality are at one on this subject. Our burdens are great, our obligations correctly estimated greater. We might face the burdens were it not for the uncomfortable feeling that they are an inheritance of evil.

Were we freer we could be of more service. The past and present of England impose duties on her as an European state, and in the importance attached to her share in the European concert there is an admission of this fact. But her attitude is almost of necessity embarrassed—wanting in straightforwardness; of slight value, therefore, as a contribution to the stability of Western order. So the concert of Europe is set aside by a closer grouping of its Eastern powers, whilst a sense of uncertainty prevails everywhere. Still, peace has been kept, and each year of peace is a gain in itself, and leaves time for the operation of that undercurrent which is bearing into power the elements of the new order for which all are looking. To distinguish the undercurrent of human affairs from the more visible and superficial stream has ever been, and is still, the most difficult task for the political observer; but that it exists at all times is a certainty to which all history bears witness.

Industrially the year has seen no steps taken for the settlement of the problems which our social state presents. The disorganisation of industry remains as complete as ever. What each year does, and will continue to do, is to manifest more clearly the hopelessness of any remedy but the moral one. As capital accumulates and becomes concentrated in larger masses, so disposing its holders to operations on a vaster scale, not only does its power become more recognised,

but its freedom from responsibility, its rejection of all control, also stand out in great prominence, manifesting the social insufficiency of the ordinary doctrines of political economy. Wielded as it is at present, all must acknowledge that the force of wealth may be a source of the greatest disturbance. It has been so in recent years often, and there have been instances in the year just gone in which it has been so on a great scale. It is sufficient to mention this grave European and French difficulty in Tunis, at the bottom of which is a capitalist operation, or I might dwell on the disturbing influence exerted in the United States by the aggregations of capital. This power of wealth is so subtle, so wholly beyond the reach of political arrangements, so logical a consequence of all the existing ideas of property—I might go further and say, so inherent in the concentration and personal administration which we advocate as the best arrangement for property; lastly, so disproportionate, as a constant force, to any reaction brought to bear on it by the power of numbers—that power with which it is in the most direct contact—that we can see no hope for its right guidance unless new influences are appealed to. If a new social doctrine and a new religion are long delayed there is great danger lest a peaceable settlement become impossible, lest our industrial society be replaced by a new one, the offspring of a great convulsion. This seems to be the out-look, even after all due weight has been given to the admirable tendencies to moderation which characterise the present conduct of the working classes in this as in other countries.

In matters of opinion it were to us, with our mode of thought, but little satisfaction to note the growing decay of the older belief, if we judge the question broadly, a decay not denied by those who are most nearly concerned with it, as most threatened by it. There must, no doubt, still be a large amount of destructive work before the work of reconstruction can have its full course, but the process is not a pleasant one, and we would gladly reduce it or avoid it. Where we find our account is in the greater tolerance which is a natural result of the increase of disbelief, more, however, on the part of those from whom it is most welcome, those, viz., who retain their old belief and hold to it firmly and conform their

lives to it. We see less real tolerance in those who have thrown it off, under an intellectual pressure, without any impulse to look for a substitute—I speak generally—a good deal depends in such matters on temperament. But where the stimulus to the rejection of the older faith comes from another quarter, where such rejection is the expression of moral or social discontent, a dissatisfaction I mean with the received moral judgments or social arrangements, there the result is much more hopeful. To such lies our principal, our most direct appeal.

In connection with this point I would mention one of the congresses of the year, the International Congress of Free-thinkers—I believe that was its title. I was not there myself, but from more than one source I have got the same general impression. While very fearless and outspoken, the tone of the discussion was much more respectful to all the beliefs of the past than has been usual in such meetings. Mere destructiveness there was not. The mediæval past even had its recognition—a great advance. There was visible, further, a distinct wish for a religion which should meet the demands of more modern thought—not a refusal of all religion—an impulse towards construction which was seeking satisfaction. If I am right in this impression, there is the more importance to be attached to it, as it accords with the result of our observation—the observation of more than one amongst us—as to the attitude of the Secularist body in Great Britain. It has numbers, it has zeal, it exercises considerable power. You may have observed the attention it attracted at the Church Congress at Newcastle. Where we have most differed from it has been in the relation of the present to the past, the respect due to the whole series of our ancestors, with no exclusion of Roman Catholicism; in our judgment, therefore, of all previous religions, as in our practical attitude towards them. Under the influence of the conception of Humanity this historical difference is gradually disappearing, and there is a growing convergence for social purposes of our own faith and secularism. Where we have always been nearest it, is not merely in the social aspiration which is common to us, but in the conviction that such aspiration can only be gratified through human agency. And

I believe that, without as yet agreeing as to the form it should take, both are fast approaching, if they have not already reached, the conclusion, that such human agency must take a religious form, that unless the emotional nature of man receive its due satisfaction, a satisfaction analogous to that which the mediæval faith provided and still provides, the restless movement of mankind remains barren of real fruit, is not a true progress. It is not merely, then, the winning of occasional adherents from the Secularists that we should look to; they are the more valuable when they come, as they enable us to understand better the Secularist position, but rather our aim should be a wholesome general action on the body from which they come, in aid, I may venture to say it, of its internal self-determined advance, which will gradually bring it into essential harmony with ourselves, till such time as in the future all distinction vanishes.

In giving what you will expect, some estimate of our movement during the past year, I would say that it is wise not to think too much of our actual position. We have set our hand to a given work which we know is likely to be hard and obscure, not admitting any rapid success. Let us accept this and pass on to action as if all were favourable, only questioning ourselves strictly as to the means we employ and the spirit in which we employ them—aiming, in fact, at a clear understanding of our difficulties, but without dwelling on them. We cannot think to substitute a new religion for one long established without great opposition. It was so of old, it must be so with us. Let me quote an account of the early Christian days which may be consolatory:—‘The changes in the moral are usually wrought as imperceptibly as those in the physical world. Had any wise man, either convinced of the divine origin of Christianity, or even contemplating with philosophical sagacity the essential nature of the new religion, and the existing state of the human mind, ventured to predict that from the ashes of these obscure men would arise a moral sovereignty more extensive and more lasting than that of the Cæsars; that buildings more splendid than any which adorned the new marble city rising from the ruins of the conflagration, would be dedicated to their name and maintain their reverence for

'an incalculably longer period; such ratiocinations would have met the fate inseparable from the wisdom which outsteps its age, would have been scorned by contemporary pride, and only admired, after their accomplishment, by late posterity. The slight and contemptuous notice excited by Christianity during the first century of its promulgation is in strict accordance with the ordinary development of the great and lasting revolutions in human affairs. The moral world has sometimes, indeed, its volcanic explosions, which suddenly and violently convulse and reform the order of things, but its more ordinary changes are in general produced by the slow and silent workings of opinions remotely prepared and gradually expanding to their mature and irresistible influence' (Milman, *Hist. Christ.*, ii. 48, 49).

It is a passage I commend, both for fact and judgment, to some of those who watch our slow growth as a religion, and who comment on it with defective knowledge of their own history. For ourselves, I am constantly referring you to the records of early Christianity, as full, to us, of encouragement as of instruction. Carefully made, the comparison of its origin with our own is not to our disadvantage. And it is curious how much of similarity such a comparison reveals. But it is not my present purpose to pursue the comparison. Those who are familiar with Christian history will find it often recurring. I confine myself to our own case, after mentioning and taking into account one necessary distinction.

The religion of St. Paul was the final issue of a philosophical movement. So is the Religion of Humanity, if the association is closer in the case of the latter. The religion of St. Paul moved slowly and in obscurity, whilst the philosophy had long been widely accepted, and was constantly attaining a more complete ascendancy. The coalition between the two was only effected after the religion had won its way to the government of its own world, and by an impulsion of its own. The very small interval between the creation of the Positive Philosophy and the Positive Religion must not be left out of sight when we are seeking light from the parallel above instituted. Their close intimacy is of good augury. Therefore it is that when we recognise the slow growth of our Religion it by no means follows that we allow

a like slowness in the spread of the philosophic conceptions on which it rests; on the contrary, their acceptance is really very rapid. We hear much at times of nineteenth century thought. Is not that thought really Positivist thought?—is it not, in a word, little as it is willing to acknowledge the debt, modified and shaped to what it is by the thought of Auguste Comte?

To return to the Positivist movement. I spoke last year of two centres, both in Paris and London. One of the two in Paris, that with which we were most in connection, has wholly disappeared. In London both continue, and one has placed itself on a much firmer footing than before, by the possession of a really good room, as I am told. Carrying forward our thought to a time when such differences as exist in our judgment of the course to be pursued shall have disappeared, when all asperities shall have been smoothed by time or removed by death, looking solely therefore to the interest of our cause, with due allowance for incidental evils in the present, and not affecting indifference to the pressure exercised on our effort here by the mere fact of its disapproval by a large and influential body of our co-religionists—a disapproval not unaccompanied with much and I cannot but think increasing agreement in act—I may say that this solid establishment of another centre is a gain of strength. It is evidence of the extension of our doctrine—it is a guarantee of the continuance of the movement, in one form or another, in case of our own failure.

In connection with this second centre, I may notice the very useful work it has done in giving us a second and cheaper edition of the *General View of Positivism*. This admirable statement of the great outline and principles of the subsequent construction is worthy of all study where there is leisure, but there has been throughout a tendency, against which I have consistently struggled, to a rather exclusive value of it. Therefore it is that now, as heretofore, I remind you that Auguste Comte did not rely on that work as capable of bearing the main stress in the effort of propagation; that four years after its publication, when he had had ample time to judge it, and when his conceptions had reached a higher stage of development, he condensed his religious

construction in the *Catechism*; that it is the *Catechism* (with a complementary work of a political character, the *Appeal to Conservatives*) to which he looked as the ordinary manual of religious disciples—this is the necessary consequence of its containing that construction; that in the translation of the *Catechism* into English he took a keen interest, which seemed to me a sufficient justification of my own effort. In fact, it was translated during his lifetime by one prematurely lost to our cause, Mr. Fisher, of Manchester, but it was a translation that had to be set aside—so others judged. Therefore it is due to our master, as it is wise for ourselves, to give the *Catechism* the first place, where one work only is wanted. There is an obstacle in its price, but the sale of the first edition is sufficiently advanced to justify us, even as a money matter, in giving our attention to a second, on terms which should bring it within the reach of a larger number. I have, I may add, often expressed my opinion, that in most cases oral propagation is the true method where it is available; that our books are but a secondary mode, most valuable when we cannot have the first, but often as powerful for deterring as for attracting, so peculiar is our mental and social environment. It is mainly by living contacts that all religions have spread, and that ours must spread. A philosophy may gain adherents by isolated study, religious convictions imperiously demand the support of human association.

I spoke just now of our own failure as possible. Let us consider what we have done and are doing. Our action has been continuous; this room has been open every Sunday during the year, though on one or two Sundays there may accidentally have been no meeting. Most of the year there has been the simple religious service which we use, during the rest there have been meetings of a conversational character, and from our experience such meetings have been felt to be of great use. During the later months there has been an evening meeting of this less formal kind. The usual social gatherings have also continued with the quiet persistence which should characterise Positivist conduct. Cautious almost to slowness in beginning, we should be very resolute in continuing what has been begun, this very

344
394
Esper
resoluteness inducing great deliberation as to the first step. The Library has gained both in order and number, and slowly advances to completeness. The portraits of the leading representatives of Humanity are nearly all acquired. The liberality of Dr. Wood, an American friend, has again, this year, been exerted in our favour. It seems questionable whether we can hope to complete the series from any authentic source; if not, the three or four wanting will have to be supplied from the imagination. It would surely not be difficult to idealise them—Apollonius of Perga being characterised by the cone; Hipparchus by the starry sphere; Innocent III. by the papal tiara. Throughout the year we have had the addition of music, giving a different character to our services; I would express my own and the general gratitude for the kind perseverance of those who have in their various degrees helped us in this way. There is a desire to advance beyond instrumental music. I share the desire, but do not see how it can be accomplished at present. I would only urge on this subject that we all give due weight to the experience which testifies to the value of congregational singing, even when as a mere question of music it is not of a high order. In this, as in everything, social considerations should prevail.

The Sacraments administered have been two, Initiation and Marriage. The Initiation was the completion of the sacramental reception mentioned last year, in the only case in which circumstances admitted such completion. The Sacrament of Marriage was administered to two complete disciples of the Religion of Humanity, who had the courage to accept in full this institution as it is modified by the new Faith. I repeat what I have said on other occasions, that none of us can better serve our cause than by this acceptance of our social Sacraments, and for many reasons this is most difficult in the present time as regards the chief of those Sacraments, that of Marriage. All of them are strictly optional—they are freely taken or declined, that is. Most of them involve no difficulty other than such as attaches to the general adhesion to the Positive religion. Marriage, as we institute it, is less in accordance with the opinions that prevail. To socialise it, to take from it its peculiarly dual

character, to bring it under the influence of the great maxim of which every day shows increasingly the moral value—the maxim which inculcates on Positivists the duty to live openly—this should be our aim, in strict accordance with the Positivist doctrine that the State or society ought to exert a very strong influence on the family, which otherwise tends to be a stronghold of selfishness. Those who accept the sacrament in this spirit do, I think, a real service, and deserve, on a just estimate of all the obstacles which opinion places in their way, much honour. Every fresh instance smooths the path for those who come after them, helps, at the birth of the new order, to form the tradition to which our children will adapt themselves with ease.

I often hear, both from within and from without, of the difficulty of our religion. Without now discussing the point, to all within I may urge that its Sacraments, at any rate, present no difficulty in their general conception and as to the obligations they impose; no difficulty I mean as to understanding what these obligations are—their practical discharge is another matter. The words in which Auguste Comte has instituted our nine Sacraments are found in the Catechism, and are given again in the fourth volume of the Positive Politics—in some cases modified, or with important additions, as in the case of Marriage more particularly. Attentively read, his language is clear, and the institution is so important a part of Positive worship, gives so valuable a condensation for practical purposes of the whole religion, offers so complete a conception of a definitely ordered life, such as the life of every rightly judging human being should aim to be, that I would urge on all to read and digest, so to gain a thorough understanding. First taken as a whole, then singly, the Sacraments would afford food for that which has ever been judged the most profitable kind of meditation, the meditation which is in immediate connection with practice and with the formation of right habits. It is a minor advantage that such study would throw a light all around it, clearing up much that may at present seem obscure.

Outside of our own special sphere there is ground for encouragement. There has been no slackening, quite the

contrary, in the religious advance of the Liverpool Positivists. Theirs has been from the first a religious impulse, with a most truly social bearing. I would always speak with great caution of others. But I need not be careful in expressing the pleasure which my intercourse has given me, or the sense of support which follows from the existence of an independent body of co-religionists animated by the conviction that the religion is the one thing needful: the sure pledge of all other achievement. They have lately lost one of their number by death; one who had given in his complete adhesion, though he knew that death was on him; his burial was a purely Positivist act, beautifully performed by Dr. Carson.

The work of the Birmingham Positivists is done under greater difficulties, partly as having been more recently begun, partly owing to the peculiarities of their social atmosphere. They persevere however, with a wise moderation adapting their method to their circumstances, and not without good hope of gradually increasing their number and making their action felt. The same may be said of Wolverhampton, as far as the perseverance is concerned. The prospect of increase there is not so good, in the judgment of those who are most capable of forming an opinion. The more honour is due to persistence therefore. I could not learn that there was any chance as yet of a Positivist movement in Manchester. There is in that city, as far as I know, no one whose circumstances enable him to attempt a beginning; the essential requisite in all such cases, the existence of some one around whom others may gather, is therefore wanting. In Newcastle I have good reason for saying that this requisite exists—good reason therefore for hoping that in that important centre there may be a beginning of Positivist organisation. In Edinburgh, again, I am persuaded that this is the only real want, the only obstacle to the setting on foot some simple Positivist organisation, and there, from what I saw, it might be so easily removed. Very simple might such organisation be in the first—an occasional or periodical meeting in a friendly way—nowhere are such meetings better understood. I speak from a grateful recollection of several. In the loosening of the hitherto

dominant belief which is generally admitted in Scotland, and to which English attention has of late been not unfrequently directed, what we offer may surely be expected to be weighed if it be but presented. Hardly any direct result, however, do I look for from my efforts there just at present; but it was something to bring the subject before considerable numbers, and without impatience as without discouragement we may wait for its gaining ground, especially if the interest in it is kept alive by others, as I am glad to learn is the case.

Out of London it seems easier to realise how entirely our progress is bound up with the presentation of the religion as the primary object, the offer of something to take the place of that which is passing, or has passed away. I say seems, for I do not know that it is really so, if we sought our true field of action, even here. Those who leave the old faith are tempted by secularism, if men, but women are not drawn to it, so that we have no serious competitor if once a return to the old is held to be impossible.

I have gone over the towns in which there is, or has been as yet, any direct action of the Positivists. That it may with prudence be soon begun in others, I feel confident. I believe that quite recently, I should add, it has been begun in Leicester. We cannot trace the penetration of ideas, we can only at a given moment attest their presence. What has already taken place in some towns may well be on the eve of appearing in others. Our part is to wait, and let no occasion slip; our want is an old one, labourers for the vineyard.

Hitherto we have seen only Great Britain. On the progress of Positivism abroad I will not touch here, except to say that there is good evidence of its making progress in Europe, and out of Europe—in South America for instance. But in such a review as this, I must not omit India, where the number of its avowed adherents has satisfactorily grown this year. The increase is such that Mr. Cotton, who is working with zeal and great judgment also, as his position requires, holds to-day a meeting in honour of this festival; a meeting essentially of the same character as this, at which I believe all but himself will be Hindus—friends, most of them, directly or indirectly, of Dwarka Nath Mitter, the fruits of whose beautiful life are seen accruing to the faith in which he

died. In a letter from one of those who will be present, several other native gentlemen are mentioned, whom the writer considers to be feeling their way towards our religion—as the sole hope of mankind—not without doubtful points to many who approach it, but so superior as a whole to all others, that all doubts are put aside, as completely overweighed in the balance. I think you will agree with me that on this side there is something to encourage us. And this Indian movement may easily extend much farther. For what some feel, others may feel, viz., that the spread of the so-called English education in India, and the rush of Western ideas have so swept away the traditional beliefs, and with them the barriers which they opposed to doubt and disorder, that it is necessary to see whether there is not some belief which, on more tenable grounds, may command assent. All reasons, practical and historical, militate against the faith which their conquerors proffer, no reason more solidly than the bearing of those conquerors. Some take refuge in a peculiar monotheism, but with most the process of dissolution has gone beyond that, and this numerous class it is to which our religion may present itself with every chance of a fair examination. It awakes no prejudice, it has no past to depress it. All its short history strongly recommends it.

So far for what has been done. What are we doing? We are holding on under great pressure of various kinds. The minds of those around us are indifferent, or pre-occupied, or hostile—or if none of these, then there comes in the distrust of our powers to succeed, a distrust justified by our actual want of success. There is further acting against us the adverse judgment of our co-religionists, whether they dissent altogether from our method, or differ on the ground that it is premature. This divergence must tell powerfully, as it falls in with so much in current opinion that is opposed to any definite religious forms. It is not, therefore, without reason that we ask ourselves what we are doing here; what is the precise character of our action; why we meet as we do with a certain religious form, however simple and inchoate?

I shall be very brief on this point, yet it is well to remind

Ourselves that such outward form as we adopt was a gradual, spontaneous growth, the outcome of several years of patient work without it—a response to a gradually strengthening feeling that the mere lecturing had done its part, and that if we believed in Humanity as a real concrete being—the source of all that was good for us, the object of all our service—it was time that this belief should find some expression in words, in a common act of prayer and praise, at once the evidence of our faith and the mutual assurance, as it were, of those who held it. *We believed, and therefore we spoke.* We need attach but little importance to the precise form of the expression. On the general principle of proceeding from the known to the unknown, in dutiful respect, moreover, for the belief of our fathers, which was that of our own earlier life, the form used departs as little as may be from that with which we are familiar. The essential difference, the substitution of a new Power, is quite a sufficient divergence, and this must not be hidden.

To use what exists, to throw away none of the spiritual inheritance of mankind, to assert to the full our claim to it, nay, even the superior strength of our claim—these are objects I have always held before me and openly avowed. That this course has occasioned us much embarrassment, and has acted unfavourably on our numbers, I have as little doubt as I have that it has exposed us to sneers and ridicule. Yet I still think it the true course, and am prepared, whilst I have life and strength, to persist in it. It is for others to say whether they will enable me to persist in it here as a public ministration. If it should be the general wish to adopt another procedure, and, bowing to the opposition, to wait for better times in which to reassert the principle, I would not for a moment stand in the way. It must be a matter of judgment how far we can run counter to the forces arrayed against us. I speak in no despondency as to the ultimate issue. Some time or other, be we well assured, there must come the direct worship of Humanity, direct addresses to her, her complete recognition as a living and real power. All our reasoning, all our invitations to others, suppose this. Why not begin at once? What motive is there for the believer to adjourn his testimony to the sincerity

of his belief? We are so few. We must be few at the beginning. It is so unreal while we are few. I have not so read the history of other religions: the unreality has not lain with the small number of their early disciples, and I see no ground for our being an exception.

I should greatly regret the cessation for a time of some such mode of outward worship as we practise here, domestic rather than public, yet, whatever it is, the distinct assertion, under all defects, in the face of our London world, that we are not mere thinkers, but men bent on practical objects, with a religious service before us, our sense of obligation to which service we quicken by weekly meetings—by what, as I have heard it expressed very forcibly and beautifully by one of our number, is a sacramental act of renewal of the engagement we have implicitly or explicitly taken to devote our lives to Humanity. I should, I say, greatly regret any break, for I believe that time is working with us; that the power there is in one, be he ever so isolated—the far greater power which there is in a very few, if united, to affect opinion, is indefinitely increased by the duration of its exertion. I should regret it on other grounds, for there are some—how many I know not—to whom our work here, of which our religious services are the largest part, is very sacred, consecrating the place in which it is carried on, a centre of their associations of many years.

From judgment and from feeling, then, I am for continuing in the same track, improving where we can, adding what we can, but with no concession in the principle. If by the mere mention of discontinuing I seem to strike a despondent note, it is with the purpose of calling your attention to the necessity there is for steady perseverance in our effort. It is the part of men to choose deliberately, and I think some are too ready to let things drift. We are not fallen on a time which favours inaction, any more than on a time which is oppressively discouraging to wise exertion. Sufficient motive for such exertion may be found in our past as in the present. We have not been, we shall not be, without our influence upon others. There are not a few who look to us, though I would not exaggerate their number. Our way is gradually being prepared; the hearts of men are

opening for the entrance of the new Madonna, the Queen of their love and devotion.

All that I have been saying of late recalls to my mind familiar words, words of one whose example is pre-eminently of present application. I adapt them with freedom to our use: 'By a wise master builder a foundation has been laid, and others build thereon. But let each take heed how he buildeth thereon. For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid. But if any man buildeth on the foundation gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay, stubble, each man's work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it.' All the work done will have its value; experience alone can show which was the best direction at any particular juncture, and to that test we may quietly refer our action.

To that foundation I turn, the proper object of to-day. Retrospect, prospect, and judgment, all are but secondary, a sort of incumbrance which is forced upon us by the conditions under which we work. To give ideal expression to the love of Humanity is, we are taught, the characteristic of this our greatest Festival. We can do this but faintly, if we compare what we do with what our imagination can picture as being done in the future. Entirely new the ritual can hardly be at any time, rather will it be a wise combination of the elements of the ritual of the Past. Diverse as they are to meet the diversity of circumstances, they are necessarily united by the unity of their fundamental element, the worshipper. This and the other similar meetings held to-day by the believers in Humanity must in so far be the germ of the vaster assemblies of the time to come, as this room and other similar rooms are the germ of the temples which will receive those assemblies. Spiritually considered, this unity will override all differences of scale or outward presentment. In the most gorgeous cathedral of mediæval Europe men still look with higher reverence to the upper chamber in Jerusalem. But the differences will be very great, in proportion to the increase of man's power of expression. If in an age of decaying faith, when the ideas that are to be clothed in outward form are losing their hold or are even strongly alien to better feelings, so that the substance is a

clog on the form, and is accepted only in the absence of something better—my meaning would be clear even to a Christian, who should, in the light of his own moral system, carefully judge such a creation as Mendelssohn's 'Elijah'—if I say in such an age such great effects can be produced, what will it be when all will be favourable? A faith shared by all; reason and feeling in unison; all our faculties judiciously trained and bent to the common service by noble social convictions; the Past understood and harmonised; the Present and the real more worthy of an ideal consecration; the Future not a subject for despondency but for fresh confidence on the ground of the already achieved; in short, the substance a constant stimulus to the form—those of our posterity who shall live under conditions so altered will find the task of idealisation easier each year—and not less so the task of grasping the conception they have to idealise. Be it ours, if the ease and fulness of means are denied us, to be one with them in their love; so much is in our power.

That there is a difficulty in grasping the conception is not to be contested. It is less than is generally thought, and lessens as we grapple with it, but it is there. This partly depends on its novelty, partly on the frame of mind in which we have in regard to religious ideas been so long nursed. A very forcible phrase characterises this mental state, '*alone with the alone.*' But there is another reason why Humanity, the being to whom we are to give our love, is difficult of comprehension. She has been slowly growing more fitted to be its object, and the work is not complete. She does not stand before us in any but an imperfect light. It is but of late even that we have learnt to trace her growth through the ages; it was hidden from, or only seen in partial glimpses, by our predecessors. The German thinker Schelling, if I remember right, conceived of God not as a perfect and all-powerful Being, according to the common Christian notion, in every way complete from all eternity, but as a Being who is ever advancing towards completeness, ever by effort removing from him the imperfection and evil to which it was conceivable he might succumb, one who was in a constant process of becoming perfect and all-powerful. Without

criticising this attempt at an explanation of the general order—for like other similar attempts this has its origin in the craving for some explanation—we may use it as an illustration. It anticipates one feature of our religion. It endeavours to do what our system does by its very nature, place the object of worship on the same level, under the same conditions, as the worshipper. It extends the process of growth to a being who had been considered exempt from it, with whom there was no variableness neither shadow of turning, and so renders it easier for us to apply it where it is indispensable. The imperfection of Humanity impresses us but too strongly—it is something to see that such imperfection is an idea not inconsistent with a gradual ascent towards perfection.

As with God then in Schelling's view, so it is with Humanity. She is ever cleansing herself from the obstacles which are in her way, as from the defects in her own constitution, ever rising to a greater height of power and perfection. The difference between the two is that whereas in regard to God we are always in the region of supposition, in the human reality all is within the reach of our observation properly directed. We cannot control the assertions in the former case, we can in the latter. Now, where we can observe growth, the process is not always attractive. In our own physical and moral growth—we can see this in others, and especially in children—it is often very little so. In the upward movements of Humanity there is, equally, much that is repulsive—witness the loathing which history not seldom excites in the more sensitive minds. In her present condition, as she is still growing, there is again much that is repulsive, and so men turn from her, forgetting that incompleteness can never be quite satisfactory. A calmer, more patient reflection would show that if we wish to quicken our love for Humanity, and give it fuller power over us, much assistance might be got from the study of her past, and even her present, under this particular aspect: as a harsh and painful advance from a low primæval state to the present higher condition, which again is but a foreshadowing of the future. No theory as to the origin of man affects this conclusion, for it only establishes that in long past ages what we call human civilisation was

much below what it now is, and that its successive stages of advance have been gained through much labour and suffering all allow. The past has been, broadly speaking, a sacrifice made for us, and those who shall come after us. It is for us and them to feel the power of this sacrifice as an incentive. That there is a power in sacrifice incurred for others to call forth love is an admitted truth. On it is built the more personal faith which we have left; to it appeals are being made with increasing frequency and intensity. In the social faith into which we have passed we can gain the same advantage from the same source, from the social sacrifice. The told and untold sacrifices of past generations, they in their vast series constitute a more real, more intelligible, and a grander basis than that which it replaces. They are matter of certain history, but hardly mere matter of history, so visible, tangible are their results, so closely do they border on, or press into our everyday experience, owing to the overlapping of the continuous generations of mankind. We feel as we stand amid the effort and endurance around us that the record of the past is a true one, for that what we see is but the reproduction to-day of what was yesterday, and has been through all human time. Its greater reality should not weaken its effect. That there is a certain unattractiveness in the real is true, but it has in all ages been the characteristic of the higher natures that they have faced this and overcome it. If we say of Humanity as was said of one of her representative organs in the past—I read the words last night—that she hath no form nor comeliness, and when we shall see her there is no beauty that we should desire her, we cannot turn from her on that account, for her humiliation has been undergone for us and is our gain.

Here comes in the advantage of the constitution of Humanity. She is not the past only, she is the future. She is open, therefore, not only to observation, but to the imagination. Even with observation of her manifold imperfections it is not impossible, if somewhat hard, to see her greatness and beauty. We have but to apply to her as a collective being the process we are taught to apply to persons. We have, as we are told in the Catechism, to idealise by subtraction, by putting out of sight of set purpose, not from

weakness, what has been defective, and leaving the good without its alloy. The imagination requires no such effort of suppression when it works upon the future. If duly tempered by the knowledge which has been accumulated as to the limits within which man must move, by a sober estimate therefore of his really great capabilities, imagination may work with great freedom in depicting our human future—'half divining how man shall dwell.' It is its best sphere—as is being more generally felt than it was—it has always been the highest sphere of the prophetic faculty: it will be recognised to be so for the poet. We may image to ourselves the gradual disappearance or alleviation of many evils, moral as well as material; as to these last, there is, we are well aware, unbounded confidence; we may image to ourselves a large increase in the powers and achievements of man, and we may throw back the light we gain on the humbler and darker past, and see that what has led to such great results cannot itself have been deficient in greatness. We may in fact deal with the Humanity which we love and serve—and loving service is worship, be it remembered—as parents love their children. In their love for them they bear patiently with the unruliness, untowardness, or ungainliness of their earlier years; they trace with most affectionate watchfulness the indications of better things which lie beneath the unattractive surface. They look forward to the time when the process shall be completed, and the trained and disciplined character shall reward them for all their waiting. The present thus takes its true position between the future and the past, and is controlled by both. If we so thought of Humanity—you will supply the points of difference—we should not be so troubled with the difficulty either of the conception or of our feelings towards her.

After all has been said—with due allowance for all drawbacks—with due acceptance of the persistence of the difficulty in some minds where there is an inveterate feeling which resists argument—quite admitting that Man is, as men are, in himself poor, and must strain hard to erect himself above himself; we can still claim much for Man or Humanity. Are we not justified in saying that if not

all-powerful, she yet is an efficient and active mediator between man and the world, between us and our rigorous destiny? All around us bears witness that she is so; as regards the outer conditions of our life none dispute it. That so soon as we assume a right bearing towards her she will act as beneficially for the bettering of our moral destiny, of the rigorous conditions of our imperfect moral nature, is equally, I think, indisputable, a conclusion justified by all reflection. Our moral imperfections find their real home in the narrow and obscure sphere of our personality—bring them into the larger freer environment, and the great step has been taken towards their removal. The open life which the service of Humanity recommends and makes easy is a purifier of wondrous efficacy. Again, evil has at all times been judged to consist in the single human will erecting itself into a supreme power to the neglect of the higher claims of a will outside itself. This, for us as for older theologians, is the real account of the matter, in whatever form it may be clothed. It is as difficult for us to submit our will to the control of Humanity as it has been difficult for others to submit them to the will of God; but once recognise that we are the creatures of Humanity, and the duty of such submission becomes clear, and once clear it becomes comparatively easy by virtue of that which I have already alluded to, our close connection with her, as being similar in nature. So, as she brightens with time, the Lady whom we honour and obey renders to us, her servants, more services. Her mediation becomes more efficient, the shelter she affords us more complete, for all the parts of our complex existence; her function as a deliverer from evil more evident and available. It is for us to avail ourselves of her great gifts, to give back largely where we receive largely, to give freely of what is freely given, to live as parts in the spirit which we may so easily convince ourselves animates the whole, to repay the costly sacrifices made for us by the sacrifice of ourselves.

The social nature of our faith, with the mention of which I began, makes me add a few words in conclusion, so bringing unity into the whole. There is too individual a tone in what I have been saying for it to stand without

some addition. Briefly, then, I may say that if for each of us the services of Humanity are great and increasing, so are they for the nations, whether we take these nations singly or in their more social aspect as acting one upon the other. All the functions which we assign her find a nobler and more appropriate exercise in this larger sphere. I can but indicate very shortly the mode of such exercise. Humanity, recognised as the supreme existence, becomes the mediator who tempers what by some is thought to be the unchangeable lot of man—the lot of mutual conflict. All her organs assume a new position to one another by their submission to a common superior, by their acceptance of an obligation formerly not admitted, and as yet most imperfectly admitted, but of whose increasing avowal there are not wanting signs. As a consequence of this change, peace, not war, becomes the law of their international relations; co-operation, not conquest, the object of their activity. Assuming the direction of her planet, she consecrates by her sanction the industry which turns to good use all its resources; she raises it from the degradation which still clings to it, whilst she restrains all harsher, more capricious exercise of its power; including, that is, within the range of her beneficent protection all living beings, and even the inorganic world. On the larger scale, as on the small, she shelters man from his injurious personality in material respects, and not less is she a shelter and deliverer in the moral. For she bursts the narrower bonds in which, as a social being, he is too apt to confine himself; in which he has hitherto been always confined. Family, tribe, country, race—all the distinctions of men, are not destroyed but modified and broadened by her supremacy, their true use, their eternal value, being amply recognised, not merely as necessary preparations, but as permanent institutions, essential to the right training of our nature. Socially, then, as individually, the benefits of the supreme power are dealt out liberally and freely, and the gratitude of the nations will not be less forthcoming than that of individuals. There is even much to justify the belief that it will precede this last and force it into action, where otherwise it would have lingered. The larger and more rapid

contact which marks our time may have this most desirable result.

If I have said less than I wished, I have said enough; bring before you the object of our meeting, to lead thoughts to Humanity. I conclude with the poem in which her two great aspects are so happily fused.

'O may I join the choir invisible,' &c.

George Eliot.

CHURCH OF HUMANITY (POSITIVIST SCHOOL),

19 Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C.

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

ANNUAL ADDRESS.*

On the Festival of Humanity 95 (1 January, 1883.)

The past year has been fruitful in subjects of interest : I touch on some of the principal.

In my address of 1878, I drew attention to the position of the Jews in relation to our Faith. This year has brought that still suffering people into great prominence and led to much discussion of its character and prospects, the discussion bearing on this point : How it stands in relation to other people? We cannot be indifferent to any portion of Humanity, less than any to one so intimately bound up with all our history and personal associations. That the Jewish nation has sinned against others as it has been sinned against by others, that it has suffered from its own errors as well as from the covetousness and hatred of others, this need not be denied. Is there any nation of which so much cannot be said? We have not to go back on its errors, further than is necessary for understanding its actual circumstances. We may wisely go back on all that is noble in its long endurance and tenacious clinging to the belief of its forefathers ; we may wisely trace the gradual advance in its conceptions to a larger and more comprehensive spirit ; we may gladly accept the assurance of its best members, supported by the evidence of their lives, that the days of national exclusiveness are passing away, and that if Israel still clings to its separate existence it is in the same sense and degree as other peoples cling to theirs without blame or question from their co-equals. Why should the Jew not have a full national existence ?* We may seek out and use each

* The commemorative form given on pages 225, 226 applies also to this address.

point of affinity between their religion and ours and wait for the time when the grand monotheistic idea of Jehovah shall merge into the more acceptable unity of Humanity.

At this point I would acknowledge the service rendered to our cause by other English Positivists in regard to this question. I have said before, that in our present division, whatever its evils, we at any rate need not ignore the help given by expressions of opinion in which, from one cause or another, we do not take a direct part; on the contrary, we may be grateful for such help, and by a full and explicit assent to such expressions economise our own exertions. We shall see more than once this year that we have had this help, but I wished at the outset to draw your attention to the matter, as well as specially to the address to the Jews issued with the signature of Mr. Beesly.

There seemed at one time a promise of similar assistance from another quarter. I allude to the Anti-Aggression League, which was set on foot in the early part of this year, at a large, influential, and apparently convinced, meeting in Westminster. There was no hesitation in connecting it with our movement, one of the speakers openly tracing the germs of the idea of such a league to the volume on International Policy, published in 1866, in support of the new policy inaugurated in 'Gibraltar' six years earlier. The event has dispelled any hopes, and shown that the convictions on which such action rested had not the strength required for holding together a body with any power in it. On the first trial the effort collapsed, and the failure is for the time disastrous. It is a conclusive proof of the need of a greater previous change, of the necessity for stronger convictions, such as can only ultimately come from a comprehensive system of religious belief. I do not believe that the existing Christianity, and still less agnostic liberalism, have in them the power to resist the pressure of political party and national self-interest, whatever may be their hold on certain individuals. It remains to be seen whether there is such power in the Positive creed. Hitherto, in England at least, it has not been wanting to itself, and Positivism remains at present the sole, as it always has been the principal force, with any systematic organisation,

against all forms of aggressive policy. I in no way claim for it, be it remarked, exclusive possession or even advocacy of the principles it asserts on the larger international questions. My language refers to a systematic assertion of those principles.

The trial of the League came, as you are probably aware, when the question of Egypt became urgent. On that question I will say but little. Health has prevented my expressing myself more fully as yet, though conscious that it was due to you that I should do so if I could. I am the more bound to give, I may, I am sure, give it in your name as well as my own, our assent to the well-reasoned and temperate protest which again bears Mr. Beesly's signature. Without prejudice to other papers issuing from the same group of Positivists, I take his as the most authoritative utterance of his group. We are, I suppose, in general agreed in our condemnation of the action of our Government, in the recognition that other nations should have what we claim for ourselves, the full liberty to settle their internal disputes for themselves; that respect for each national existence is the first principle of present international relations, as the respect for each man's individual liberty is the first principle of all wholesome society. Content with this broad principle, I will not now touch on all the disagreeable incidents which have led to and accompanied its violation, any more than on the dangers which beset our path now that our injustice is in its primary object successful. No reason has been shown, apart from our own national interest, why that principle should have been set aside in this particular case. We may note with pleasure the expression of Mr. Bright on the subject: 'I hold,' he says, 'that the moral law is not intended only for individuals, but is intended also for the life and practice of States, and I think the present case is a manifest violation of international law and of the moral law.'

In what state the European concert, on which, and justly, so much stress has been laid of late, will come out of the present embarrassments, can hardly be foreseen at present. Everything points to its being very seriously impaired. It has always been of a delicate constitution, in part, I must

think, from a defective conception of what should be its constituents, in a greater degree from the general condition of European opinion which recognises the particular interest of each separate State as the supreme guide of that State. And that interest is still judged entirely on the principles which have prevailed in the past, has consequently the aggrandisement of each, not the safety and peaceful co-operation of all, for its avowed object. A concert on such a basis cannot be otherwise than unstable. How entirely mutual distrust is the law of Europe, how far we are from the empire of peace and industry, has very recently been shown by the thrill of uneasiness running through Europe which has been called a European crisis, uneasiness for which no adequate cause has been assigned; it must be clear to us all, as Englishmen, from the discussion on the Chaneel Tunnel, the paramount objection to which is precisely this feeling of distrust: it matters little which Power it is that is most distrusted. On that discussion I will only on the present occasion say thus much, that, so far as I can judge, the decision on Positivist grounds should be in favour of the Tunnel—and I am glad to think that there is a considerable amount of popular opinion enlisted in its support.

I have not seen it, but I believe I am right in saying that there has been issued during the present year, a plea for restoring Gibraltar to Spain. I do not know on what it rests, how far we are on common ground with the writer, but the question must from time to time recur, nor can it admit of doubt in which way it will ultimately be settled. I mention it because it connects with and embitters all our relations with Spain, which, as shown by recent events, are under more than usual tension—it can only be a question of degree whilst this question remains unsettled. Do justice to the suppressed but ever understood demand of the Spanish nation, soothe by reparation its legitimate indignation at an insolent wrong, and one important element in the discord of Europe would be removed, nor would there then be any real obstacle to the admission of Spain into the councils of Europe, where her voice should be heard by virtue of her past, I might add with reason, of her future.

The policy of reparation which we welcomed last year in reference to South Africa has been carried still further this year. We may, I suppose, assume that the restoration of the Zulu King is carried out. It is to be regretted that it was not done sooner, and more handsomely; that even now it will be clogged with conditions, the imposing of which is an ungenerous abuse of our power, a power derived from a confessedly unjust war. I read an extract from this morning's papers bearing on this. 'Cetewayo complains bitterly of being shorn of much of his old territory, and says he was compelled to sign conditions as to his restoration to the Zulu throne without even being allowed to discuss them.' How far this last part is true I know not, the former, I believe, is quite correct. It would seem the simplest dictate of that morality which is in word recognised as supreme, equally for nations as for individuals, that where you have done wrong, and allow it, you should in no way avail yourself of the passing success of such wrong to strengthen yourself or weaken your opponent. But this is not our practice, and that it is not sadly mars what there is noble in the return upon acknowledged error. There is a certain meanness attaching to all our concessions, as if we were afraid of seeming too simple. Yet greatness and simplicity are near akin. But since she was first launched on her career of maritime discovery and subsequent conquest of American, African, and Asiatic, populations, there has been little greatness in the conduct of Europe, little that is not repulsive to the awakening conscience of the West.

The Zulu restitution requires another to complete it. For there yet remains a victim of injustice, whose ruin has in no way been atoned for. I mean Langelibele. He has no powerful nation to force our attention, but it is not disputed that he has been wronged, and the wrong should be atoned for as far as is now possible.

In connection with these remarks I place the question of the European action in Oceania, or Australasia, which is even now the subject of an inquiry on the part of our Government. It would seem that powerful states, such as England and France, might keep a firmer hand on their citizens, whether colonial or other, and not suffer them to prey on the weaker

populations. They are ready enough to shell and destroy towns or villages when any attack is made upon those citizens; 'exacting vengeance, giving lessons,' such are the terms as we know. Why cannot they make it clear to the ruffians and pirates who goad or have goaded to retaliation the unaggressive inhabitants of the Southsea Islands, that they are amenable to the sternest repression on the part of their own Government? There might be a wholesome concert for such a legitimate object.

The closest and calmest observers still admit the gravity of the condition of Ireland, the little reason there is to trust confidently to such remedial measures as have been devised. Here again there is the same halting in our reparation for the past. If some of the measures adopted are conciliatory in character, others have been the reverse. Be the justification of it adequate or not, the fact remains, that the actual government of Ireland by a free nation, its stronger colleague, is in form most repressive, and where is such repression to stop? Its necessity is a condemnation of the government which renders it necessary, and however necessary, it is daily adding to the long account against that government. There seems no outlet to the vicious circle of English action; for which reason, amongst others, I remain unshaken in my conviction that none of the remedies proposed, singly or collectively, can meet the difficulty, that the full independence of Ireland can alone be satisfactory.

It is daily more openly admitted that the influence of the greater Ireland outside Ireland, more especially of the large Irish population in the United States, disturbs all our home calculations, and the emigration which so many good men mistakenly, as I think, advocate, can but increase that population and freshen its interest. The intensity of feeling on the subject in the American Irish is allowed, and it is naturally contagious. Besides, excluding any such consideration, attentive study shows that it is far from being merely Irish, what we speak of as the Irish Question. Ireland is the battle-field of more than one set of conflicting principles; the discussions which concern it are of national and political interest, but also in a high degree of social interest, as carrying us into the heart of the industrial pro-

blems of the day. For instance, the land question, which in Ireland assumes such a character of urgency, has a bearing far beyond any merely Irish application.

In its general industrial aspect, as in its political, society in the West continues in disorder. The conflict of labour and capital is constant, as are the evils under which, in both portions of the Western World, industry is labouring as far as concerns the mass of the industrial population, and perhaps not in the Western World only. One remedy is put forward as sufficient. The boldness and definiteness of its proposal constitute, so far as I can see, its main value. In other words, it has but a negative value. No purely economical solution can offer more ; so complex a social state as the present demands for its healthy advance a treatment which shall omit no one of its many sides.

The remedy proposed attracts many minds. This is natural under the peculiar circumstances of our social arrangements. The right ordering of property in land is of primary importance in relation to industry, and many of our evils may be traced to defects in that ordering—pauperism, for instance, in a very great extent. Whether the nationalisation of the land is the true form the remedy should take is not to be discussed here. I mention it because during the year it has been the most prominent of the industrial topics. On them as on the general political topics I have only this to say at present, that all are of secondary importance on a true estimate of the social state in which we live, necessarily so to us who preach a new religion. If such is needed, it is the one want which overtops all others, and which, if supplied, will carry with it the satisfaction of all others in conformity with its own principles. What is imperatively necessary for the passing hour, and pending the acceptance of the religion, must be done and accepted ; but whatever is so accepted must be looked on as provisional, as necessarily subject to revision when the larger question shall have received its solution. You will not understand me as being indifferent to the industrial wants of our time ; on the contrary, their full satisfaction is one great task which devolves on our Religion, and will be the test of its triumph. It is always so spoken of by Auguste Comte. You are familiar

with it under the form of the incorporation of the proletariat into the social order.

I now turn to the retrospect of our Positivist movement during the year; a distinct subject from that which I treated in my commemorative address in September, when the whole of the last quarter of a century was under review. Proceeding from the circumference to the centre, I mention first the satisfactory continuance, with a fair amount of growth in number, of the Positivist group in India. I have been compelled during most of the year to give up my correspondence with it, but on resuming it I find that all who were with us are with us still, one only being taken by death. In India, as elsewhere, one great obstacle is the recoil from the past. Those who have emancipated themselves from their ancestral order are loath to adopt a new one, and to many, it would seem, the dislike to the new one is, not unnaturally, intensified by its coming from Europe, the connection with which, as it exists at present, inspires them with a just and increasing aversion. I remark on the curious contrast which presents itself to us if we study the official or semi-official estimate of our position in India, and then turn to all such expressions of native opinion as are accessible to us. I doubt not but that the official world is lulling itself with false dreams of success. But in the midst of all obstacles the new Religion is taking root in India; the beginning has been made, all after that is comparatively easy, though still hard enough. In the full tide of our own difficulties, we can readily sympathise with those who, in that distant land, are in agreement of thought and action with us; I am confident that they fully return any kind feeling on our part. Mr. Cotton writes me that he holds a meeting to-day, as he did last year, in entire sympathy with our own. It is curious, I may add, how essentially the same is the problem upon which we are both engaged, when you strip it of all local accessories, all special national antecedents.

I have had more communication of late with America, the United States I mean, but I find it very difficult to estimate the prospect there, or the conditions which hamper our progress. I conclude that many of them are common to both countries—certainly the greatest of all is, viz., the prevailing

indifference to any proposal for social and religious reconstruction. That there is attention paid to what concerns European Positivism is clear to me, and if so, there must be a certain field for Positivist action. In New York there is ground for hope that the resumption of efforts will have the encouragement of finding that previous labours have not been thrown away.

If I pass now to England it is not from want of interest in other countries where our faith is making way, but because, with another opportunity for general remarks, I prefer in this address to keep more close to our own immediate action as a body. I may say at once that the annual retrospect is this year more than usually encouraging. We know the limits of any such statement, we are not likely to exaggerate our advance. But on the other hand we need not underrate it. I give my reasons for what I have said.

During the three years and a quarter of its existence the Liverpool organisation has moved steadily forward, with such increase that the New Year sees them able to take openly their due position as a church of Humanity, the name they wisely and consistently give to the new and larger building in which they now meet. They met yesterday to celebrate this festival, as the wisest course under their circumstances. Without hesitation, except as to this or that detail, they have stood forward from the beginning as a religious society, and have found in that attitude a source of strength for themselves, whilst they give support to others outside them. It cannot but have a great influence on other towns that in the second city of England this form has been adopted, the Religion of Humanity been definitely proclaimed, and its proclamation accompanied with a visible embodiment. No imperfection there, any more than here, can really impair the virtue of such action. With admirable courage they are looking forward to an amount of continuous work to which we are quite unequal. Their success, however, will not be confined to their branch of the Positivist body. Brother calls to brother, voice answers voice.

Each environment has however its own peculiarities, to which a wise attention must be paid. Each town therefore, or rather the Positivists in each town, must judge cautiously

their own powers and convictions, and the state and requirements of those around them, from whom they hope to draw adherents. To my own judgment it is clear that each year makes it more rational to adopt the boldest policy, to insist without reserve on the cultus of Humanity, and to give it as complete outward expression as we can, and therefore I heartily welcome a similar judgment on the part of the Liverpool body, I am grateful for the encouragement it gives. But I am not the less disposed to wait patiently for those who think it more prudent to proceed by a more tentative method. So in the room which our fund has placed at the disposal of the Birmingham Positivists, and which will be inaugurated next Sunday, we stipulate for no particular course on their part. It is at their free discretion to use it as they see fit, with the single condition that it be exclusively reserved for Positivist purposes—a condition freely accepted. It is, you will see, a great step made in advance, for Positivism thus gains a home in Birmingham, and the experience of Liverpool shows what a strength and concentration the possession of such a home gives to the whole action. Permanence naturally encourages persistence. We have every reason then to hope for good results from this fresh instance of fixity of domicile.

The time cannot be far distant when we shall reach the same point in Newcastle. There has been for some time a regular meeting there on Sunday mornings. I took one of the regular course of Sunday addresses in October. The meetings have been continued since. Mr. Quin is in favour of some simple religious service, in which an address will form part. There will, in Newcastle as in Liverpool, be music, both vocal and instrumental. Here again we have helped from the general fund, and shall be ready to help more, if as in Birmingham a permanent room can be secured, a home for Positivist action, or even without this condition, if need be. Here too, as in Birmingham, the fullest liberty as to the form adopted is compatible with our help. No more than the simple condition stated above need be attached to it. If not the best conceivable course it is the one which all our experience indicates as the safest. Unity will come through union,—it is the normal order of the terms, and is as

applicable to all collective action as to individuals, and the **lax** union of the present will gradually become firmer by the **natural** influence of our doctrine and under the stimulus of **social** feelings.

I mentioned last year Leicester with hope. My visit **there** made it quite clear that the formation of an avowed **Positivist** centre was but a question of time. A quiet yet **determined** centre is forming—I might almost say is formed. **We** may, I feel sure, rely on the steady advance of the few **who** have adopted the central principle of the service of **Humanity**. **We** may rely on their gathering others around **them**. Leicester is more strongly secularist than Newcastle, **and** that organisation stands in our way, but without any **hostility** to us. It has pre-occupied the ground, that is all. **It** might easily become a preparation for us. If we can show **that** we offer what Secularism does, but that we offer more, **and** that we do so is frankly and nobly admitted by the **leading** Secularist in Leicester, the more constructive system **will** gradually influence the one that is less so—possibly absorb **it**. Meanwhile the friendly relations which exist between **such** as have in opinion emerged from Secularism and those **who** remain in it are not to be roughly set aside. It is a **most** honourable feeling which leads the former to avoid a **rupture** by too immediate an insistence on differences. They **may** well wait, the current is with them.

In general in northern England, more especially in **Sunderland**, though I should not omit York, I gained the **conviction** that there is a disposition in our favour—a **readiness** to hear us whenever we shall be able to set forth our **faith**. I regretted that I had not more time at my disposal, **and** hope, if I live, to work next year on the indications **gathered** this autumn. You will understand me—All must **be** on a small scale at present, here one and there one; but **still** there may be a beginning made—the difficult point—a **beginning**, I mean, for direct propagation of the Religion of **Humanity**, the one capital want.

I end, so far as England is concerned, with Manchester, **in** which I have lately heard that there are chances of a **beginning**. I know myself that the existence of Manchester **Positivists** makes it possible. I have not spoken of Edin-

burgh, because I was unable to reach it this last year, but there have been Positivist lectures there from Mr. Quin, and only this morning I have received the most encouraging assurance with regard to the prospect of increase, from one who may, nay will, I feel sure, gather round him such Positivist elements as already existed.

I distinguish the state of preparedness for the Positive religion from the openness to the general Positivist influence, which we all consider of great value, even where it goes no further. Whatever I have seen since I spoke on the point in September, wherever I have been, I have constantly been encouraged in the conclusion I then stated, that there is a real growth in this indirect propagation, a marked decrease in the repulsion which our ideas originally excited, a real increase in the disposition, if not to accept them, yet to listen to them, and see how far they can be turned to good account in the way of guidance, with a latent but growing conviction that our system is eminently strong for guidance. If I were to single out one point which more particularly impresses this conviction on others, it would be the weight the Religion of Humanity allows to continuity, its persistence—nay, its insistence on it—in the direct religious tradition without any abrupt breach, thus weakening the shock of the inevitable change, soothing irritation, and grooving the new into the old associations.

I come now to the consideration of our movement in London as a whole. Here again the year has in many respects a favourable record. I have already recognised the public services of the other group of Positivists which meets at Newton Hall. I may add quite generally that such public services are but the more outward forms of a continuous effort for the spread of the doctrine which cannot but have its direct utility. No difference should prevent our seeing this, as I have consistently throughout acknowledged. In connection I believe with that branch there has recently appeared a notice inviting to some action in the East of London, where from earlier experience I have always thought there must be ground well prepared for the reception of the new Faith. All accounts, those emanating from the Christian clergy perhaps more than any, bear witness to the

clearance there, a clearance resulting from various causes, as regards the older forms of belief; whilst I know, from contact with it years ago, that there is a widespread and deep social feeling to be found in that large population, which is so peculiarly situated. With two such favourable conditions, the only question is how to begin, and it is a pleasure to think that it is a question which is being publicly asked by one who lives and works in its midst.

The same question has been put and successfully answered in the North of London. With great energy a centre has been there formed, and the demand it involves met. The appeal has been made for help to all Positivists irrespective of any difference, and both sections have co-operated. This justifies what I have more than once said, that the world outside will refuse to take account of such differences, and that such refusal will gradually overbear them, so far as to make all contribute alike to the common work. This extension of Positivist influence is most acceptable in itself and as a symptom. It is specially remarkable in that it was begun by one who was a Secularist at the time he began it, and yet wished to make clear to himself and to his brother Secularists what Positivism was and what it offered, under the conviction that nothing but good would come of friendly contact. Mr. Chappelow will I hope have no reason to regret his courageous step, which deserves ample recognition on our part—and he will be glad I am sure if I also allude to the services of those who aided him in tiding over the difficulties of his beginning, Dr. Kaines and Mr. Sulman. I am not fond of much personal allusion, but this case is an exception.

For ourselves here it has been out of our power to make our services or meetings as continuous as we could wish. Thanks to the aid of Mr. Crompton, who got some help from others, for all whose assistance I am very grateful, there has been as little of a break as possible, not more in fact than for the summer months. The first six months, that is, were entirely filled; only two of them I should say by myself, so that the work thrown upon others was considerable. In September we had the annual commemoration; in October a series of conversational meetings; since then the services have been

regular. The social meetings have not been interrupted. There has been but slight increase of the library, the completion of which should be kept in sight. The portraits are not yet quite complete, but I expect that they will be completed in the course of the year. Additional power has been given to the organ, and the permanent screen fills up its arrangement. We have also more satisfactory lighting. Lastly we have a shop attached at which all our publications can be procured, and the use of which will grow with time. So far our wants have been supplied one by one and our institution is more perfect.

We have had but one sacramental rite during the year. I use this term rather than Sacrament to indicate that there was something peculiar in the case. The Sacrament of Marriage in our domestic worship has its own special features. When, after years of a complete marriage, on the validity of which no shadow of doubt could rest, I was asked, for the full satisfaction of those who had since their marriage become Positivists, to confer on them the Positivist sanction, their acceptance of its conditions being complete, I could not hesitate to meet so striking an instance of strong conviction, such a testimony to the value and beauty of the Positivist Marriage, in every way which lay in my power. The case was exceptional, but our system shrinks not from meeting exceptional cases. Few requests could more manifest the power which lies in our religious system to affect human conduct, to induce a rational revision of the whole of life by two who sought to harmonise their existence with the further aim of becoming more qualified to serve Humanity. This, shortly stated, was the spirit of this remarkable act. In connection with the general subject of sacraments I would state that there have been two commemorations of Positivists, Dr. Burnell and Mr. Jones, taken from us by death. With the mention of these two ceremonies the record of the year closes.

You have placed in your hands to-day a new and larger edition of the prayers which we have had in use for the last two years, with the addition of one or two introductory and explanatory forms which are now more or less familiar to you. It remains still but a small collection, which will,

however, gradually grow : our various ceremonies ensure its growth. I value it in principle, rather than for anything in the form. The introduction of direct prayer to Humanity, in the sense in which we use the term, cost me a great effort, and it is not without effort that I have induced myself to continue it. You and others will judge whether it is useful. I have no doubt that the assertion of the principle is useful. I made the original effort at a time when I thought there was a real wish for it, an instinctive impulse towards some common expression of our communion and aspirations. I have seen no reason to retract the judgment on which I acted. I am aware that to some these prayers are an obstacle, but I have never so much looked to the removal of obstacles as to the strengthening of our own position from within. In a common phrase of the day I wish that in all things we should have the courage of our convictions. I believe in the value of personal prayer, I believe in the value of common prayer ; and when there was sufficient assent I put this belief into the form we have used, and which has grown little by little. Besides, obstacles have a tendency to disappear when you face them, and what is a hindrance to-day becomes a strength to-morrow. Looking back on seven-and-twenty years of Positivist action—it is full that since, amid well-nigh universal objection, I published 'Gibraltar'—I may say that there is hardly any point in our system which I have not been urged to change in form, as an unwise exposure of our cause to objections. I have seen the objections abandoned and the coherence of the system recognised as conclusive against alteration of the details.

This, at least, is the general result—and we may gain confidence from it for the future. Let us trust the strength of that which we have had placed at our disposal. I have been blamed for adhering too closely to the conceptions and instructions of our Master. It has been from no blind confidence that I have so adhered, but from the conviction gained by constant study, that his meditation and service and moral growth had given him a comprehension of the whole subject to which we should find it our best wisdom to submit our much less solidly formed judgments, and that in matters of detail it was best to work according to his instructions,

HH

trusting to the event to sift what was permanent from what must disappear. When impatient with any decision I have said to myself what I say to others—wait. The decision may be erroneous, but it may be in real accordance with the wants of the race, only at variance with our own special tradition. And reflection and the assent of others have often shown that it was so.

One word more on this subject of the form we give to our movement. I am aware that a grave responsibility rests on me or any one who occupies a similar position—the position of a leader in our cause. I may say that originally I did not take it on myself. I was urged by Auguste Comte himself to step forward. I had had no previous thought of doing so. I shrank from it with a just sense of the consequences, but ever since the first step I have faced all its responsibilities as far as I saw them. I accept then the responsibility of this initiative in regard to our worship of Humanity, the giving it a form intelligible as a religious form to those around us, the form for which they are accustomed to look in all religious meetings. It is however, I repeat, the spirit only which is permanent in my estimation, the particular form will adapt itself to our wants as they arise. I feel in regard to the step that it is warranted by manifold considerations,—by the sanction of Auguste Comte to a similar essay; by the whole spirit of his later instructions to his disciples; by the character which he wished our propaganda to take—it was not for a course of lectures that he asked for the Pantheon; by the real wants of our time, which underneath all its superficial commotion is seeking for a satisfaction to its religious feelings; by the long experience, lastly, of our Western past, which, throughout its utmost extension, has ever attached a supreme value to the community in prayer. Tabernacle and temple, synagogue, mosque or church, cathedral or meeting-house, all alike attest the truth of this statement. In any case, it is not on me only that rests a grave responsibility which I accept; other leaders cannot decline it for their different judgment. The future must judge between us.

From all I have said you will gather, I think, that I look back on the past year in the general with more pleasure than

usual, that I have greater confidence in the immediate future than I have felt warranted in expressing in later years. The formation of new centres is the main source of encouragement; after that comes the strong evidence given of the spread of interest in the whole subject by the rise of isolated inquirers in various places. There is, in short, more life in the movement as a whole.

Where we are really weakest, relatively speaking, is here, here in London, here at the centre. I regret it, but so it is, and it is a real hindrance to our growth. It is not the smallness of our number that I speak of, but the want of zeal in that small number, as regards such common effort as is made.

If I speak of it, it is to be true to the facts. I will leave the matter to your consideration, the more readily as in its depressing influence it more particularly concerns myself. We who take any active part must work on as long as we can in the discharge of our social duty. Is the idea of social duties as bearing on the details of our Positivist conduct sufficiently present with us? Such is the question I would submit to you.

Working on in the above spirit, we may have one comfort: we are warranted in thinking that our small audiences are not the exact measure of our audience. We may feel that we speak beyond our apparent limits. I have often the proof of this. Number is a great force and encouragement, but there are greater forces, and if, as I believe, we are in the true direction of the world's movement, no deficiency of number will destroy our power. The seed we freely and apparently uselessly scatter here is borne to other portions of the garden to root and bear fruit. If any will give us help, it will not be a wholly ungrateful task they will be undertaking.

It will make my meaning clear if I state one minor point—that of subscription. Those who recognise this as an obligation and who gladly fulfil it, too often need to be reminded of it. It should not be so. We should as Positivists have a clear purpose, and carry it out on our own impulse without depending on others. Fixity in the rules and practices of our own formation and acceptance is a feature in

our religious system on which our Founder lays great stress. We should most easily get that fixity by importing into our conduct the idea of social duty.

I noticed this in my last circular with a request that subscriptions might not be deferred till quite the close of the year, when my work is peculiarly heavy. I will not say that the request has not been attended to, but it has not been sufficiently attended to for my purpose, nearly a fourth of the subscriptions having come in December.

Whilst on this money question, I may say that as the demands on us from outside increase, our power to meet them, our money power, should grow too. I would not press greater effort on any that make it already. But death lessens our resources, and it is allowable, with the above proviso as to present effort, to draw attention to this diminution. There may be some who with a general interest in the cause, with the means and the will even to help, do not bring home to themselves that money-help is wanted and would if given enable us to act with more energy and more security. All that we do here or elsewhere rests on free effort and involves expense. With this bare suggestion I leave the subject.

I have gone more fully than usual into our circumstances in the widest sense, without any concealment of such weakness as exists, without, I hope, any exaggeration on the good side. The strength of our cause enables us to avoid both. The proper object of this Festival still remains, however intimate the connection between it and all that has been said. For what is it that we wish to bring into all our political and social questions as the true source of their right settlement? Is it not the controlling influence of Humanity? Why, again, do we scrutinise so closely our progress and our methods? is it not that we are seeking the best means of furthering that influence by the spread of her Religion? So that as all speaks of Humanity, I may be brief in what more directly addresses itself to her celebration on this her special festival. What follows will mainly bear on the first of the two questions—her controlling influence.

We stand not, as we stood yestereve, in presence of the aggregate materials out of which Humanity has shaped

herself, but in presence of the product of the long human effort—'the seen unseen Humanity,' which through ages to come it will still be the effort of her children to perfect. It is the church of the past and the future in its unity which we have to contemplate and to idealise to-day; it is from that unity that I would seek inspiration, the only unity attainable by mankind, the supreme aspiration of all the noble, whether dead or living. To translate this aspiration into fact, such is the mission of our Religion; of the weak but rising, which confronts the powerful but declining, faith of our fathers; a contrast, in the terms of which there is no discouragement for us.

The cause is worthy, all exertion is justified, and needed. As year follows year, each new year registers the legacy of trouble which it inherits, and which it will transmit, probably not lessened,—it is well if it be not augmented,—to its successor. It can hardly be otherwise, if we compare the evils with the remedies, and still more with the principles advocated by those who offer the remedies. We have heard much, perhaps enough, of the tribalism of the Jew. What is it but tribalism, on a larger numerical scale, this English imperialism which asserts its claims as the voice of the highest national duty, whosoever may for the time be the mouth which utters the claim. This again is but one instance of that intense nationalism which is dominant throughout the *élite* of the world, this Western Europe. And if that nationalism be temporarily set aside for a common conduct, the oppressive and aggressive attitude of the united West is again but tribalism armed with more dangerous powers, an union for discord not for peace, for the weakness of which union we may be thankful, knowing the way in which it would show its strength. From such a storm-tost political ocean rises the new Goddess, the power that would speak peace to the world—what are the chances of its being listened to? In what lies her superiority?

It is no new proclamation this message of peace. It takes us back into the centre of Christian ideas, to all the hopes and promises which gathered around their first introduction, and which are still part of their claim, though so mournfully belied by experience. Grateful for that first utterance as the

spiritual sanction of the partial achievement of the temporal order, the enforcement of peace throughout the world by the statesmen of Imperial Rome, we may see why, whilst it survived the Roman Empire to be the expression of the latent hope, hardly preserved amid the turbulent order which followed that Empire, it needs restatement from a more human and higher point of view. The proclamation of peace on earth in the form which is familiar to all, is a proclamation from without and to the individual, most directly at any rate. It could not be otherwise than to individuals, if only from the fact that peace was the condition of things in which it was proclaimed, in the name of a being imagined to be outside man and unaffected by his struggles. Later it was enlarged in its application, and sought to be made the law of all Christian peoples, whilst war was the rule outside them.

Humanity needs no formal proclamation of peace. Her very existence requires it, and in proportion as she gathers power, ensures it. War is alien to her whole nature and conditions. She is composed of many organs, and if they conflict, each jar is felt throughout the whole frame. The proclamation of peace, then, comes from within, and is addressed to her immediate organs, the various states or nations which together constitute her. It is not in this view an idea which, from a narrower, rises to a larger use, but one which descends from the larger into all the smaller portions of the one organism. It is not difficult to see what a superior strength the idea of peace thus gains when it is the strictly logical conclusion of the constitution of Humanity, the mere outward expression of the one all-pervading principle of love, without which she could not be, in proportion to whose prevalence she is. Humanity cannot be reconciled to man, but she is Man, reconciling men to one another. The beauty of her former effort need not be questioned, but we can see that it was but an imperfect anticipation of the later.

I would lay stress on the fact that the influence of Humanity touches primarily her more immediate organs, the various states, those which come nearest to her by their size and composition. In our individualism, under all the weight

of our teaching and of the opinions that prevail around us, we are apt not to give its full force to this large social aspect of our doctrine, and it is a loss to us, both as regards the vigour and the ease of our conception. No link in the chain which binds each of us to the race can be neglected with impunity.

Such is the ground on which we claim superiority for Humanity as the instrument of peace to the world. Such is the ground on which we confidently affirm that she must succeed in giving it—once enthroned she is peace. We cannot frame any adequate conception of her except as a peaceful whole. She cannot look on man from the outside, and his state here as a trial, by the right use of which he fits himself for another. She claims him wholly for herself as an agent in helping forward her work, as inconceivable except as part of her, as her creation and her servant. She speaks through him to his fellows, and through his fellows to him. It is one widening circle of mutual duties, the right discharge of which is impossible without peace. Humanity organised on a military basis as Christendom was during the later mediæval times, you will see is an absurdity, and so far as her organs are now so organised are they disqualified for understanding her. This contrast of her intolerance of war, with the tolerance of it by all her immediate predecessors, is decisive in her favour, and it is a contrast which the whole history of the theological period warrants us in drawing. She condones that her period of adolescence—but she would not continue it.

Leaving the sphere of Christian thought, I would endeavour to throw light on the action of Humanity from a contrast with an older faith, the faith of Bouddha. I speak of it without hostility or disrespect, rather with very high admiration. It is sacred as one of the provisional forms instituted by the instinct of Humanity for guidance and for shelter. In some points akin to Christianity, in others to our own system, especially in its limitation to what is strictly within man's reach, it is admitted to be of profound interest. It is unaggressive and peaceful in character, but that is not the point I select. It is the personality which pervades its noble teachings, its doctrines even of renunciation and of the noble path, which I wish to contrast with

our more social presentation of the same truths in our own religion. I speak with diffidence on this subject, because I see that there is considerable difference of interpretation. Still I can hardly be mistaken in saying that its history, the history of its founder, shows that Bouddhism most directly appeals to the individual, and holds no language which immediately bears on the conduct of states, or societies of men. Renunciation, to the Bouddhist, is confined to the personal life of each individual, and is a means by which he fits himself to attain the great object of his existence, the immunity from the disturbing influences of self, the cessation of personal consciousness. It proceeded upwards from the individual, from the unit to the sum. This is all I have to do with for my present purpose. I seek an illustration from Bouddhism, I by no means state or discuss the system.

Humanity will impose with growing force on all its organs a renunciation, the abandonment, that is, of all claims and action inconsistent with the welfare of the whole. She will do this as a consequence again of her own existence, now that it is passing again into full consciousness. Under the vague fears and hopes of an earlier stage man asserted for himself a position which he cannot maintain, as the central ultimate object of all the world's existence. From this Humanity recedes, limits herself to this her planet, and devotes herself to the wise administration of its resources and the shaping of her destinies. She recognises her subjection to an inflexible, external order, to which she submits with resignation, and to which she adapts herself, renouncing her former undisciplined aspirations. Such a renunciation, guided by the facts of observation, at once sobers and dignifies the whole of human life. For in the name of this enforced, yet in the end willing submission on her part to her lot, submission may be inculcated on all her separate portions. The State renounces its wish for domination, the Family its wish for advancement, the individual this gospel of success of which we hear so much. Again, the idea descends from above downwards, from Humanity to its smallest elements; the submission of the individual resting on the firm basis that it is the plain law of all human existence on this planet. We cannot revolt against

the facts of our astronomical position. If, therefore, when we come to those elements the moral teaching is much the same under both systems, so far as the practical result, the control of self, is concerned, its social origin, and the undisputed authority which it has in this most extensive form, give it a sanction with the individual which is not found in the reverse process, and will take from it the character of a mere personal injunction, comfort, and support which it otherwise has. As running through the whole range to which our thought can usefully extend, and finding its earliest, most basic application to the whole, renunciation is at once socialised and ennobled, and when the individual practises it for himself, he feels that he is in keeping with a law which governs all existence. The obedience of Humanity makes obedience easy to her children when once they have come to understand her action and to realise their true relation to her. The practical teaching of life which enforces renunciation of self for the good of others will thus receive a strong intellectual support—the object of the scientific basis on which the Positive religion rests. Our course is again from above downwards. We descend thus to the morality of the individual from social morality, and we get the initial germ of that from the moral control which external necessity enforces on Humanity. She becomes our supreme control.

It is a pleasure to recur to these older faiths which have shed light on other peoples or ages—a pleasure to recognise their greatness, to acknowledge their contributions, whilst we enlarge and adapt them to our own uses. Looked at, as we endeavour here to look at them, as creations of Humanity, they cannot but be fruitful of instruction. They have a special usefulness for us, for it is the besetting fault in the English mind, as it has been trained by its insular Protestantism, to be absorbed in partial considerations and to rise with difficulty to the more general. It is a fault of training, not of capacity, as is evident from our past. Our system enables us to act with effect against this tendency; it enables us, if we will use it. It enables us to gain, it enforces on us the gaining, familiarity with all the better thought of the race, and the best of the better thought is its religious thought,

that thought which in its various forms has been the spiritual food of its millions—not the literature of the few,—the inspiration of its great social efforts, which, as they pass one by one before us, by their number and incompleteness singly suggest some larger effort completing them and reducing them to unity, suggest therefore Humanity. To-day I have rather followed the opposite course, and, as the occasion warrants, taken the unity as my starting point, and indicated on one or two points its superiority to, its control over, the number from which it has gradually issued. I have come down from Humanity to its partial representatives.

Sovereign on her own planet, within certain limits arbiter of her own destiny, gradually improving and beautifying her habitation, gradually perfecting her own nature—such is the power to whom our service and our love is due, as the sole known source of all our powers, achievements, and enjoyments. As each generation for the time represents her capacity for action, our service and love may advance her welfare. The duty of serving her is more and more acknowledged, and the acknowledgment will certainly lead to its acceptance in act. It is the love which causes hesitation. It will come with the discharge of the duty, as a rule at least. But it is not here that I need dwell on this hesitation. Year by year Humanity appeals more to the feelings of those here present, her service becomes more attractive, her being better understood, her power over us more unquestioned. The growth may be slow, but there is growth, growth in conviction, in inward satisfaction, to the intellect, and still more to the moral nature, as we feel the strength Humanity wields to save us from ourselves, growth, therefore, finally in the lovingness of our service. Love is life's only sign, says a Christian poet—and the language is true in a measure—it assumes that love will not fail to produce itself in service—on this assumption it assigns love its just pre-eminence. We too assign it pre-eminence, though the world judges otherwise. It is for us to make it reverse its judgment by imprinting this character of lovingness on all our service, making it appear, what it is to many of us, one on which every better feeling is engaged. That the common judgment is being gradually changed, I argue

from the attendance here of so many women, I use the word many relatively. I have always seen and acknowledged that the particular point on which we are strong here is the number of women who are attached to our movement. It is growing, I feel, in the best way, by the power of sympathy, the power which is the root and being of Humanity.

So all comes round to her—as is most fit when we meet in her special honour. We pay it with willing hearts; be the willingness extended to her service. She is worthy of all our devotion.

CHURCH OF HUMANITY (POSITIVIST SCHOOL),

19 Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C.

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

ANNUAL ADDRESS.*

On the Festival of Humanity, 96 (1 January, 1884).

Assuredly there is no want of matter on the present, any more than on previous similar occasions. The years bring with them the unsettled questions of the past, and each year adds something of its own, whilst it is difficult to trace any corresponding subtraction, difficult to see what each bears off with it from the sum of evils. The revolution sweeps onward, penetrating more deeply into the inner life of societies and individuals; the older barriers lose their power or disappear, the new guidance is not yet discerned. How far is the craving for some new guidance on the increase? How far are men aware of the danger of the revolution and anxious for some satisfactory termination? On the answer to these questions depends in the main the immediate future.

I shall touch but lightly on the external questions of which I spoke last year, saying merely what may justify the language I have just used and observing the same order. Egypt is not the source of less but of growing anxiety, as the consequences of our interference, equally unjust and unwise, become more plain. The European concert is not more stable. The South African difficulties are rather more than less embarrassing; the general attitude of Europe towards weaker populations is not mending. Our Colonial relations are more disturbed, our relations with Ireland, if the case is thoroughly and candidly examined, not one whit more hopeful. Under its industrial aspect, society is as unsettled as ever. With great commercial instability,

* The commemorative form given on pp. 225, 226, applies also to this address.

our general social arrangements are daily arousing greater bitterness; the attack on them is taking a more definite form, probably increasing in weight and momentum. The conflict of opinion which has long been most active on other points, religious and political, is tending to settle down on social issues, to the exclusion for a time, so far as such exclusion is possible, of all others. This is true of all Western society.

The year's increment, to use a term familiar in another connection, the increment of trouble, is considerable. I need but instance the grave discussion pending between this country and its Australian colonies, and the Anglo-Indian explosion of race-inspired hostility to the just performance of accepted obligations. Passing beyond our own sphere, I may add, in relation to the West, the deplorable direction of French energies towards African and Asiatic expansion, at the cost of war with Madagascar and possibly with China, not to speak of serious European complications. The horizon is dark enough all round. So much may be said positively and without exaggeration by comparison, whilst we do not forget that much darker times have been, and have been weathered.

Nor must we forget that all this trouble is but superficial, a mass of symptoms—not the disease. The disorder is spiritual at bottom, and none but a spiritual remedy can have power therefore to end it. This is the reasonable conclusion from all past experience, the conclusion in which all political thinkers, as all religious minds, ultimately agree, widely varied as would be the forms under which they would state it. The stress then of our attention must now as ever be directed on the spiritual forces at work, examining their utility and their power of combination, most especially on the new and guiding spiritual power which we ourselves constitute in the present and would strengthen for the future.

After all, this is the one great interest of this nineteenth century, to which the ages which follow us will look back as the era of the religious order under which they shall be living. All the other events of this century, strong as is their hold upon us, will be seen to have had relatively no

weight. In fact the century answers, and we may gain comfort from the thought, to the first and fourth centuries of the Christian history, answers or may answer, if we are faithful to our trust. It has seen, as the first century saw, the birth of a new faith, the beginnings of its propagation; it should witness, as the fourth century of the Christian era witnessed, in what remains of it, such acceptance of that faith by the vanguard of mankind as may guarantee its decisive triumph. Would it be too much to say that it has witnessed this? Weighing well the assent the Faith of Humanity has conquered, and the obstacles it has had to encounter before such assent could be given, I feel that what we have seen of the struggle in our own time is of propitious augury—a fortunate *omen* of the war, a foretaste of the final victory.

Whatever may be thought of such language, and I abandon it to its fate, the former statement remains unquestioned for all who are not slow to acknowledge themselves the disciples of Auguste Comte, the heirs of his faith in the power he revealed. All of us must feel that the work in which we are engaged is the one great work of our time. This justifies the examination in detail of the way in which that work is proceeding, the review of our movement wherever we can trace it, and as most practical for us, the careful review of our own action in particular. Yet, not to keep you too long, I shall again touch but slightly on this action, only pressing here and there a new point and treating the others in an appendix to this discourse.

The most rapid survey, however, must leave out none who are associated with us, all should be present with us. The meeting at Calcutta, of peculiar interest this year, as Mr. Cotton confers the sacrament of maturity on our leading Hindoo co-religionist; the various other meetings, partly social, partly religious as at Birmingham, religious in Liverpool, Newcastle, and Leicester; the isolated Positivists who here and there in the United States hold on in unshaken faith, not forgetting the one whom we have lost prematurely this year in that country, Mr. Mills; the new and hopeful leaders who in Brazil and Chili are engaged in the common work; such propagation as there is in Sweden; the several

French groups with their Parisian centre ; the detached Positivists in other countries, Scotland, Ireland, Australia, and Italy for instance ; the group of Newton Hall which, if not in sympathy with us, is yet, according to its judgment, serving the cause of Positivism—on this occasion none should be omitted.

The peculiarity of the case induces me to speak even now more at length of a new centre formed during the past year. It is out of London, in a genuinely country parish, where we should not have expected that at present it would be possible to have a Positivist meeting, still less, perhaps, one of a distinctly religious character, a weekly religious service in honour of Humanity, a service in which the faith in her and the life consequent on that faith should be fearlessly set forth. Yet this has been done, and if done once and in one parish, it may be found practicable in others. For in the case I am alluding to there has been no pressure applied ; the growth has been a quite natural one. A Positivist Family as the nucleus—whether in town or country the importance of this condition cannot be overrated—a Positivist Family, I say, has found, one by one, others gather to it, their own domestic worship being the original centre. Those who have come have doubtless been led to join by various feelings, the prevailing one being, I should imagine, dissatisfaction with what is offered them elsewhere, dissatisfaction with their earlier belief, and the desire for something which can satisfy the want of which they are conscious—the want of a certain moral and religious culture, of an expression of their religious nature, which is given them by a common act of weekly worship. The quiet, positive, sympathetic statement of that which we offer is found to have a power, an increasing power of attraction. Our orderly and completely respectful attitude as regards the old, with the temperate, yet firm assertion of the new doctrine is proved to be appreciable and appreciated, under conditions which would be allowed by observers who cannot be called superficial to be unpromising—a fresh proof, if proof were needed, of the weakness underlying the apparent strength of the existing religious order. Such a result is, I feel, of the profoundest interest to the whole Positivist community, as

well as to those to whom it is more immediately due. It illustrates, I add, by contrast, one of our greatest difficulties, the obstacle which our separation by distance throws in our way, not from the mere distance, though that is much, but from the absence of any sense in this disorderly aggregate of human beings that we are parts of one community, the absence of the influences of neighbourhood.

So far as the review of the past year concerns our special work here, I shall again not enter into details. It has been as continuous as our circumstances have allowed, in all its various parts—services, sacraments, meetings, publications, lectures. One not unimportant construction is now complete, the series of busts and portraits. It has been a collective effort, in which many of our number have joined. There are three to whom we are more particularly indebted—Mr. Harrison, Dr. Wallace Wood of New York, and Mr. Sulman, who have enabled us to fill up the gaps where no portraiture of genuinely historical characters was discoverable. We preach veneration for the past, we make our moral progress largely dependent upon that instinct. The room as we now have it, aptly seconds such teaching. It helps us with its images to call up and idealise the collective Humanity of bygone ages, whilst its silent influence, week by week and year by year, gives force to our wish to associate our endeavours with those of the past in the work of preparing a better future.

The Positivist Library is still imperfect. It is desirable to fill up its deficiencies and to increase it, for though at present little used, it were to be wished that no one of our body should enquire in vain for any of the works which compose it.

In this connection, I mention with pleasure two bits of work done in the course of the year: our issue of Mr. Call's translation of the *Discourse on the Positivist Spirit*, and of the second edition of the translation of the *Catechism*, which is now, by its price, placed more within the reach of all. I hear that the *Appel aux Conservateurs* is to appear shortly. We still wait for, with such patience as we may, the promised volume, containing Auguste Comte's will, correspondence and prayers.

Looking beyond our work here to the other Positivist action in London, there has been, so far as I know, no new movement begun, but what had been begun has been steadily continued. We have but to wait and watch the results, for we are, and shall be, for some time, in a period of dispersive effort, which, if I cannot consider it the best state under our circumstances, will I hope throw up good. Let us each carefully, and in the light of Comte's teaching, examine our own proceedings.

As a whole, I have to say as I said last year, that the impression is favourable. It has been a rather restless year here and without us; certainly there is no decrease in our difficulties; the old words are applicable, without are fightings within are fears. But on a survey of the whole movement in Great Britain there is no excuse for discouragement. We have for long years now counted the cost; known how little result our preaching a new religion was likely to have in our own time and under the peculiar English antecedents, and again I say it, on the whole the result is more satisfactory than there was reason to expect.

As to ourselves, here also I have no change to make in my statement. Our weakness is great in this centre of the new order. It seems not unlikely to increase under the pressure exercised upon us by other centres, which it were untruthful to ignore; under the increasing opposition to us which I think is perceptible without; again under our own personal failure to satisfy the requirements of many; lastly, by virtue of that which is our special function, the firm persistence in an unpopular method of presenting the truth we have to offer. On this I can see no compromise; strength, numerical strength, must come later.

I am more and more struck with one danger to our immediate growth—a danger common to all manifestations of Positivism whatever—the danger from impatience. I do not mean so much impatience from within, though there is that too to contend with in ourselves as in others, most in ourselves perhaps; but I allude now to impatience from without. All great and complete changes are of slow growth, and there has been none completer than our own. The evils of our time are great and numerous, and felt to be very

pressing, and the cry for remedies is urgent, and it is a cry for immediate remedies. In fact, whatever is proposed attracts in proportion as it seems rapidly applicable. It is remarked of us by observers, it is felt at times painfully by some of ourselves, that we aim at results which require long time to mature. In a period of material advance, such as the present, where all is in restless motion, men will hastily clutch at anything that seems to have a promise in it, and turn from all deeper examination. We must abide by the consequences of our convictions, and wait for the juster estimate of them which we feel sure experience will enforce. This by no means precludes our ready adoption, our proposal even, of all the palliatives which we can suggest or accept as useful. If in these respects it is our most direct business to influence and form opinion, where wise action is possible we should be foremost in acting. But for a time the opening for our action may be small. It seems probable that it will be so. What is popularly known as socialism—we are in our own way and in a sense socialists—may, with its rising force, brush us aside, or completely overshadow us as it hastens to the attainment of the aims it sets before it; so reducing us to mere spectators of a fresh crisis. We cannot share its hopes, we cannot agree with its means, but we yet wish for a very profound alteration of the established order. I assume the point that socialism is a rising force in the West generally, and it is with the West that we are most directly concerned in this matter.

We may be set aside or overshadowed, but the under-current of human advance will yet be with us. Moreover it rests with us whether we are so obscured or not. Due effort on our part may prevent this, and such effort may count on great indirect support. For as the particular power which I speak of gathers head it will excite alarm and resistance. It is evidently so working at present, and great efforts will be made to master or to guide it. For it is not we alone who are threatened. Other and essentially weaker doctrines and organisations will be most exposed to the attack, and in their danger will not be averse to invoke principles which we hold in common with them, but which, at home, as it were, with us, are alien elements with them, and will ultimately, there-

fore carry their influence to those who can best apply them. To give a plain instance of my meaning: in the formidable struggle which threatens capital throughout the West the full sanction which our doctrine gives to that precious institution of Humanity in its principle may at once be valued in itself by those otherwise opposed to us, and may bring the strength to our cause which will flow from the full and wise application to practice of the reasonings on which that sanction is given.

Returning to ourselves. I do not think little of numerical strength. I wish we had it here, for I know that the want of it discourages us and deters others. But it is not the sole, nor even the first object, neither is it even the most real strength. We may easily make too much of it. Whether weak or strong in numbers we have a certain work to do, certain principles to carry out; in the faithful discharge of this duty we shall find strength to our need.

In dutiful reverence to the teaching of our master, and adopting the method which he follows in all his later works, we go at once to the centre, we put the Religion in the very front. Its central dogma, the Humanity whom we serve, on this we insist as the necessary universal principle. Around her we would condense everything, from her draw out everything. A new religion seeks to replace the old. It must then offer at once at the outset a substitute for the guides created by men to meet their spiritual wants. It must offer some innermost truth, short in statement and of easy apprehension, on which all can fix, some one object to which all can refer all their thoughts. For the spread of a new religion such a condition is absolutely necessary. It has been found so in the past, and the experience of that past has been allowed its full weight in the present, as regards the construction of our Faith. The three great historical instances of a conscious change in religious belief, the religion of St. Paul and Mohammed, both alike issuing from and guided by the third, which was the creation of Moses, are found to conform to this demand. The one Jehovah—the one Christ—the one Allah—it is the same method in all three; the bringing into one simplest form, one central unity, the truth on which the respective faiths of each rested. So might

they be most easily grasped and acted upon by those to whom they were preached. As the legitimate successor of the three, we proclaim one Humanity, in the simplest and shortest form, and the rapidity with which this central truth, once proclaimed, has wrought itself into the whole of Western thought,—has imposed itself, I might say, on the West, is a strong evidence in favour of its being of easy apprehension. I speak of the adoption of the name and general conception—not of the adoption of the Religion—although that too is greatly helped by this readiness to accept the unity on which it is built. Such convictions tend to translate themselves into action.

Obedying then this long and sound tradition in insisting on the central truth of our faith, we proceed to expand its consequences to the full, to put forth the religion of which it is the centre, so that, as far as in us lies, none who come to us may in any way doubt as to the character we would imprint on all our work, any more than as to the end we have in view. It is not our wish to inspire a mere general interest, to rest content with the increase in number of those who have a knowledge of the new belief. We aim rather at bringing them to its full acceptance as a rule of life—in a word, we offer to others what we have received, a definite religious system in all its completeness, not a social doctrine. Many years ago I said we are a religion or we are nothing. The years have but added strength to this conviction. Unless we are offering something of real value to live by as religious beings, in the place of that which we, with others, by our very existence, help to destroy, we are but one additional hurtful influence, disturbing and weakening, when the deep wants of man are settlement and strength, swelling the foolish cry about general enlightenment and the advance of public opinion, not building up a living church, the source of order, the sure and sufficient guidance in the spiritual direction of mankind. Positivism as a mere intellectual conception has been justly said to be a heap of dry bones.

Secondly, we preach our Religion religiously. By this I mean not as a religious ideal only, which at some time more or less distant will so gain on the thought and imagination of men that they will flock to it without effort, but which mean-

while need take no definite shape. No—we have asked ourselves what form our work should have, in what order the several constituents of our religion should be presented. And the answer we give such questions is clear. On this point we are not to seek. The teaching of Auguste Comte is most explicit: 'Our religious initiation must begin with the worship which by revealing to us, synthetically, Humanity, cultivates the feelings adapted to the mode of existence she prescribes.' This is his latest teaching, revising and reversing his earlier judgment. It is the teaching of that which is our manual of devotion, our guide in life and in our action, the Catechism. The sentence I have quoted is a sufficient expression of Comte's whole disposition in his later years, when he steadily pursued one object, the strengthening the supremacy of feeling by its direct culture. Such is the one aim of all the Positive worship throughout its three divisions, and it is to the worship he assigns the first place as an instrument of reorganisation. The whole is meant as a special remedy for a special disorder. The disorder is the insurrection of the intellect against the heart—its undue exaltation. The remedy lies not in crushing the intellect but in disciplining it, in assigning it its true work. Thus the best and most positive discipline is indirect; it lies in giving its full power to feeling, placing it in its just place and supremacy, and so leading the intellect to minister to its wants, to furnish guidance.

Herein, shortly, we have the strongest ground on which our special method rests. We accept Comte's teaching and in such form as is practicable we give prominence to the worship. That form is dictated by the persuasion that it is best to break as little as possible with the old, with all our earlier associations—that adherence to them makes our purpose more easy for others to understand.

When I speak of preaching our religion religiously, I use the word in the ordinary sense as it is understood by the vast majority of our countrymen. We present it, therefore, in the form which time has consecrated and with the ordinary accompaniments which, not only in this country, but throughout Christendom—nay, throughout the world—have in some degree or other been always associated with the name

religion. Nor is it of light importance, that we thus keep faith with our own past history—with the obligations which the progressive consecration of this room—with the obligations which years of patient action in the same direction before this room was ever thought of impose upon us. The advance has been cautious, for the uncertainty of the ground was great; but if cautious it has been constant. So that our Sunday meetings have gradually assumed that character of religious service which is so repellant to many, so that a religious character attaches to the room, as also a distinctly religious appellation. It must ever be bound up with the history of the English branch of the Church of Humanity, as the centre from which all other religious action, indeed, all Positivist action, has emanated, and without which such action could not have been. Imperfect, defective, weak as it may be, with the aid of those who are now separated from me, without their aid since the separation, the work done here has ensured, at any rate, this result: that in one country at least the construction of Auguste Comte stands out as a Religion, not merely as a doctrine of a real political and social value. Other countries will, I am confident, shortly move in the same direction. If this hope be too sanguine as yet, there remains the certainty that at some time the principle on which we have acted here must triumph; that one day the traditional forms of human worship, enlarged and adapted to the newer requirements, will become again a common possession in use by all.

There is yet a third point to mention as forming part of our general work here. We seek both by the substance and the form of our action to lead on to the religious discipline which it is so necessary to revive, to awaken a sense of its value and to excite the determination to form anew where they have been lost, or to recast, the religious practices which need to be fitted to the change in belief, practices which are essential to our best life, and which in a system such as ours will naturally bring about a truer discharge of our duties as members of a given family, as citizens of a given state, as members of an universal church. This is, of course, the aim of all religious teaching such as ours, which can never lose sight of the social nature of man, never appeal

merely to the individual, nor offer a merely personal object or sanction,—which should always fuse us in our kind. But there has been a sad decay of discipline in the widest sense, and of that culture of our feelings which is its indispensable foundation, if it is to be, as we wish it to be, free and noble. In fact we would not let die the effort of the mediæval church. We would not renounce the inheritance of spiritual guidance which it left us, the training of our emotional nature by which it set such store and by virtue of which we are yet preserved from much evil. We may make great changes in form, we may often have to rest on other grounds that which we keep, but still we must keep it, for it was and is suitable to our nature under all outward alteration, it was drawn from a deep study of that nature, from transmitted observation accumulating from one generation to another. It is, I must think, some help to the attainment of this object if we constantly are reminding ourselves of our religious service and growing familiar again by weekly practice with the observances which we have been too ready to discard.

To satisfy, first, conviction by the simple faith in Humanity, to cultivate our feelings of love and devotion to her and our fellow feeling as her servants and co-workers, to revive disused habits which are essential to a right life, this is the threefold aim of our services here, not to the exclusion of other aims, but as standing above them, and bending all others into conformity with itself, a threefold aim which is seen to answer to the three steps in our progress to full spiritual growth in the new circumstances in which our change has placed us.

It is no light task we have undertaken, that of setting forth in this way a new religion. We, with those who in some four or five other places are at one with us, form a small body with all the world against us, and with the larger number of our co-religionists also against us. We need therefore to take careful thought as to our course—as to the means we employ in accomplishing our arduous undertaking. Faithful to our sense of its grave dignity we should eschew all methods which fall below its demands. As a security for our eschewing them we would train ourselves to look upon it that our first and truest duty is to form ourselves so as to

answer to our noble work. We would make it our first object to *be* something, before that in a restless spirit we set ourselves to do something. If we estimate carefully the power there is in that which is committed to our charge, we shall see that the attraction it exercises may be most aided by our own manifest submission to it ourselves, by our moulding our own lives to it. This will not hinder our activity, but it will take from it restlessness and impatience.

I am aware that this way of looking at things seems to many too much of a return on what is worn out, cast too completely in the mould of the past; that a new, a human, more hopeful, more joyous faith demands a wholly new presentment. I too, believe, that as we move on and enter farther into the reign of Humanity there will be changes in the direction indicated. But I do not believe that at any time the principles which I have stated will be set aside, that there ever will come a time when a careful discipline will not be needed for man's complex nature, and when such discipline will throw away the ancient methods worked out by our immediate predecessor, the mediæval church, on the foundation laid by her predecessors, and sanctioned by the testimony of all the great religious teachers outside her pale.

And if there cling to our attitude here something that reminds others and ourselves of the rather depressing judgment of human life, which has earned for the Christian faith its designation of the worship of suffering, that, too, I should not be over careful to deny or avoid. With the most hopeful I hope for a better time; with the most confident we here are confident in the triumph later of a brighter and nobler order. But in the present. Well, in the present, with all the sadness of the past upon us, with all the suffering and the sorrow that we see around us, with broken lives and imperfect attainment, with an uncertain and low'ring prospect in the immediate future, I own that I think that we shall best support our courage and be most in harmony with our surroundings if we let ourselves be chastened and subdued rather than exultant and gay. It will be so easy to accept a more unsorrowing atmosphere.

Something of this same feeling pursues us as we consider what Humanity offers, what she has to do. We may triumph as others triumph in the achievement of the past, in that growth of intellectual power by which she has mastered so much knowledge, knowledge of the orderly outer world in submission to which she moves on in the path of her destinies, knowledge too of the forces that aid her, lifeless or living, knowledge lastly of the laws of her own inner being, and of those of her individual organs, and as others we may look forward to an unbroken advance in the same course of mastery. We may triumph as others triumph in the power thus conferred on her, in the consciousness that if rightly used it will place the order of which she is part, more within her reach to amend and beautify. We may feel that here again we are but on the threshold of attainment, with ever new conquests open before us. We may triumph lastly as others triumph in all the beauty with which her great artist souls, poets, musicians, painters, sculptors, and architects, have endowed her, and here again look forward securely to the greater result which art will arrive at when it shall work under the conscious inspiration of the Being it has ever instinctively served. In a word we may see quite clearly that Humanity rests on and grows by the ministrations of all three, Science, Industry and Art, by knowledge, power, and beauty, and may with gratitude and reverence observe how she has used such ministrations hitherto, and forecast with a not unreasonable exultation the greater use to which she will turn them in her long and calmer future.

In the present also, the servants of Humanity may accept all the benefits which the three powers named are capable of giving us. But, whilst accepting them, we can see that none of the three, nor the three together, neither science, industry, nor art is religion. This is but too certain. Their votaries are strong and triumphant around us, and it is true that neither the old nor the new faith appeals to them with success. As their sense of power grows they turn to the enjoyment of their respective pursuits with a more and more undivided attention, with avowed impatience of all discipline, and as far as those pursuits are concerned, of duty. It is

not to the strong or the wise, now any more than of old, that a new religion can in the first instance address itself with hope. They do not want it.

Yet never was the power of such a new religion more needed ; never has it been more urgent to preach and proclaim Humanity as the new gospel for the nations, as the true source of salvation for man in all his manifold aspects. The very strong repugnance to the control which flows from her acceptance, the very strong assertion of the counter principle of national or personal interest, the angry defiance which is often hurled against the new doctrine which is intruding itself on this interest-governed world, all are testimonies to this imperative necessity on which I would insist. It is as a general message of peace to all the national branches of the one human family that we proclaim Humanity in the first place because they are her more immediate constituents and as a whole their instinctive desire is for peace, so that whilst war is yet but too frequent it is more and more generally condemned. But to so proclaim her we cannot rest on scientific demonstration or elaborate teaching. The proclamation must be in a simple intelligible form, speaking of one great unity in which all peoples find a refuge and a shelter. And it is just the same on the lesser scale, when we descend, that is, from the community of nations to any narrower union, or to the community of any one nation, or in the last case to the unity of each separate person. Throughout the whole range open to her action the sway of Humanity is the one great want of mankind, to her is the desire of the race.

Let us suppose some part of the future to have joined the past, and the church, which in our weakness and through many obstacles we are helping to build, to have grown to some degree of strength, so much so as to be a visible influence in the direction of the world,—that some beginning of the reign of Humanity has in short been made. What will be her action? Will she enter quietly into possession of the rich inheritance which has been accumulated for her? Will she be able to set herself to enjoy the products of past labour, to rest in fact in possession, guide an harmonious

order, and shelter it from all disturbance? It is clear we must go far into the future to arrive at such a state, if ever mankind shall reach it. The disorder at present is so great and the powers that work for disorder so strong, that for many generations the power of Humanity must be engaged in a remedial, mediatorial action, if I may use the word. We may hope—we may even be sure—that a lighter and more enjoyable social atmosphere will be the lot of man; that there will be a sensible increase of all well-being. Still for a long time the stress of effort will be to lessen sadness, assuage grief, protect weakness, control the strong. The new church, as her Christian predecessor, will have to stand pleading between the oppressor and the oppressed, resisting by her steady influence the remorseless forces which have been set in motion, tempering the abuse of all the capacities of men. Thus, as her predecessor again, will she make her way to the hearts of men. But if successful in the final issue, her course thitherward will be full of painful embarrassment. She will win her crown ultimately, but through exertions which will be largely alloyed with failure and sadness.

I recur to this idea of the one central unity, because I am sure that in our seizing on it and applying it consistently and fearlessly lies our real strength as believers in the new Religion—our only strength in these its faint beginnings, when, suffering from the loss of our great teacher, we face the task which has devolved upon us with no sufficient guidance. It is then that we feel the want of some rich source of inspiration which, overriding all partial views, all detail of conceptions, places us at once in the very heart of our human existence, and unfolds before us all the varied aspects of that existence in their due relative proportion. It is a vivifying presence ever with us that we want to enable us to hold on amid the depressing influences of our time and country, if, that is, we would in the teeth of such influences continue to labour at the formation of a new church. Give that up and all changes. Life becomes easier, and if our circumstances are otherwise favourable, full of enjoyment. But adhere to the purpose and thought of your youth and manhood, work without ceasing towards a new and higher order,

and life can only become easy by your absorption in *that* work.

But in such adhesion the past and the future of Humanity seen in all her fulness as we contemplate her to-day have ample power to uphold us. If trouble comes upon us ever fresh from new sources, we know by the dead in whose presence we live and whose leading we enjoy, that few if any of them worked any true work without its involving them in suffering, and the question of Augustine repeats itself for us: shall we not be able even to follow? If, again, the darkness of the present, its pain, its separation, its losses, weigh upon us at certain times, and the small result issuing from all adds to our gloom, we can call up the future, and see the small seed-grain grown and yielding fruit, sure that no part of our work, much less any good that there was in our lives, has been lost. It is but a tiny contribution, but it swells the vast stream which bears to other generations the products of their predecessors. It has increased the sum of good, it lightens the burdens of the future, and we are content that it should be as it is with us.

There is a light then thrown on the present from two sides. It has, moreover, its own strength. A life of shocks and endurance has a value of its own. See how true soldiers feel this. We, the soldiers of Humanity, should not crave to be exempt from this experience. The disorder and suffering around us, the trouble which falls on ourselves, should both be accepted as stimulants to our nobler selves, as raising us out of the dull selfishness in which we might lose ourselves, as giving scope for action and carrying us to a higher being.

So in every way Humanity justifies herself to her servants, even in this period of revolution and anarchy, offering them a noble service in which losing themselves they may gain true freedom. What more can we ask? Thought and action find scope in that service. Love is of its very essence; her existence is impossible without it. Vague aspirations, intemperate desires, idle straining after acquisitions beyond our power—these may be denied us, but her service will give us a disciplined and well-ordered life, moving to great ends, permeated and enlumined by the supreme grandeur of love.

May we not with all propriety address her as St. Bernard
Presses her prototype—

So mighty art thou, lady, and so great,
That he who grace desireth and comes not
To thee for aidance, fain would have desire
Fly without wings. Not only him, who seeks,
Thy bounty succours; but doth freely oft
Forerun the asking—whatsoe'er may be
Of excellence in creature, pity mild,
Relenting mercy, large munificence,
Are all combined in thee.

CHURCH OF HUMANITY (POSITIVIST SCHOOL),

19 Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C.

APPENDIX.

ON THE POSITIVIST MOVEMENT OF THE YEAR.

(1) The Indian group remains as it was in number ; its meeting will be under the presidency of Mr. Cotton, who has been in England much of the year. The first administration of a sacrament—the Sacrament of Maturity—to a Hindoo gentleman, is an event of real interest.

(2) With the United States there has been regular and increasing communication. Such a loss as that of Mr. Mills is a great blow. But the scattered Positivists, or friends of Positivism, not only remain faithful to their faith in their isolation, but become more convinced that their country needs the new religion. Their social environment is often very discouraging, the prevalent direction taken, both by thought and activity, being most unfavourable. This heightens the value of their persistent adhesion.

(3) In South America the immediate prospect is brighter. Under the impulse of M. Lemos, in Brazil, of M. Lagarrigue, in Chili, there seems a real likelihood of sound advance, and that in an emotional and cultural direction which may react on our European movement.

(4) In Scotland the way is being prepared. There is great ripeness there, especially in Edinburgh, for some new belief, as there is a growth of unsettledness as regards the old. I may mention, that quite lately I heard that the central doctrine of Humanity had been set forth with great force by Mrs. Besant in the Secularist community of Edinburgh. So from unexpected quarters comes at any rate a general assistance.

(5) In Liverpool, what was undertaken, has been carried through without break. Rather differently circumstanced, the Liverpool Positivists avail themselves with energy of

whatever is favourable in the difference. With each year, I feel more grateful, not merely for personal kindness, though that is much, but for their consistent and ever growing support of the method of propagation which we abide by in London. With unquestioning boldness they preach the Religion of Humanity, through the medium of a systematic worship, governing all their other action by this central truth.

(6) The Positivist room in Birmingham was formally opened the first Sunday in last year, and has been in use since, so far as our friends there have been able to use it, helped as they have been by members of both groups in London. The very possession of such a room—a fixed seat—suggests fresh efforts. As a beginning, there has been formed a French class. In Birmingham, as I stated last year, all has been left at the discretion of those who preside. No condition, beyond its use for Positivist purposes, was attached to our offer of the room. The tendency has been cautiously, but steadily, to move in the same direction as in Chapel Street; the rudiments of a worship have been introduced.

(7) The same may be said of Newcastle, where again our central fund has placed at the disposal of the Positivists a room, which in all essentials resembles our own, and where they have the same service, with the addition of singing. There had been, I found, decided growth, and Mr. Quin is less alone than he was in point of complete agreement. Still his difficulties are such to tax heavily his energy and endurance. I connect with Newcastle any scattered Positivists in the north as well as the most kindly and hearty sympathisers whom I met in Sunderland. The hearing they gave to the preaching of the Religion was most tolerant and candid. Agreeing heartily with most of its conclusions and practical applications, their feeling is that it is wiser at present to continue the movement begun some few years back by Mr. Brockie. The Free Associate Church which he then founded has worked much good, has peculiar claims on their gratitude and support, and is, as yet, all that it is prudent to attempt under their local condition. I may differ from the judgment, but I can heartily respect it. After all, it is moving in our direction.

(8) There need be no hesitation this year in speaking of Leicester as a centre, with a quiet and determined energy. Its relations to the Secularist body are altered in some degree by the death of Mr. Gimson, but there is no unfriendliness between the two bodies. In Leicester, as elsewhere, progress will be slow, but the essential step of beginning has been made.

The year's retrospect is on one point peculiarly satisfactory. There has been so much more friendly intercommunication of the different bodies, with more also of direct mutual help. Auguste Comte valued highly the personal contact of his disciples, and in our actual state such contacts are of the greatest importance in the case of the different centres, for they show to outsiders that a movement which may appear very weak in one particular place has friends and supporters elsewhere. I hope there will be no falling off in this respect during the year on which we have entered. I am looking forward with pleasure to having amongst us shortly Dr. Carson, the energetic minister of the Liverpool branch of our rising church.

(9) Looking at the whole of the Positivist movement in London, I would notice the adoption at Newton Hall of a commemoration of Auguste Comte on the anniversary of his death, our practice for several years. I would also acknowledge, as on previous occasions, the public services rendered to the common cause by the group which meets there. I am told also, nothing has reached me directly, that a more conciliatory tone prevails towards our group—one calculated to lessen the evil of bitterness which attended the separation. Differences of judgment will exist, more especially as to method, under existing circumstances. We must allow for them, and secure as much co-operation as possible where we agree, and there is substantial agreement on political matters as yet. From the beginning I never saw why there could not have been this co-operation on such questions. On our respective methods a recent utterance in the 'Pall Mall Gazette' has emphasized our divergence. This it were useless to conceal. I regret it in the common interest.

In the North of London the movement inaugurated last year by Mr. Chappelow has been steadily continued. Towards

the close of the year it took a new shape. It has formed a distinct centre, under the presidency of Dr. Kaines, affiliating itself through Newton Hall to M. Laffitte's direction, whilst retaining the form of action which it had previously adopted from Chapel Street. I content myself with the bare statement of a proceeding which was, historically as it were, communicated to me in the last days of the year. Here, again, we have but to accept facts and await their results.

(10) In our own regular work the year has been most marked by the sacraments. The number of recipients has been greater than usual. The sacraments administered have been: Presentation, Admission, Marriage, and Maturity—this last for the first time in England certainly—I believe anywhere. It was a striking testimony to the power of our religion that four men in ripe manhood,—had Dr. Burnell lived he would have been a fifth,—should voluntarily and openly thus pledge their full powers to the service of Humanity. All felt the impressiveness of such an act, spectators and participants alike, and we may well hope that the pledges then given will be amply redeemed. The other sacraments were full of interest. Its novelty makes me single out this one. Each year shows more clearly the high importance of this sacramental portion of Positive Religion, in complete agreement with the experience of our predecessors. Our sacraments are the connection between the domestic and public worship, the institution to which we must look for the social support of the moral discipline which is the want of our time, and the demand for which will more and more characterise the adherents of the new Church.

In the way of direct teaching we have it not in our power to do much. I wish in some directions we could do more, especially in sociology. However, we keep this steadily before us, as well as morals, in our Sunday addresses, and shall be ready to welcome any help that we can get. In the lower sciences there is good teaching to be got all around us, if not in a Positivist spirit, and by the time the young come to us in any number for systematic instruction we shall be strong enough for the task. What at present I should most wish is either direct historical teaching, suited to our present wants in that respect, or teaching on social subjects, such as

Mr. Nicholson's Lectures on Physical Hygiene, or on special applications of Positivist principles, such as Mr. Cotton's on 'India,' and Mr. Haggard's on 'The Channel Tunnel.' All assistance in teaching, such as that given by Mr. Cox in Elementary Mathematics, by Mr. Blake, on the Catechism, by M. Colombi, in Italian, I welcome with pleasure.

But as yet, teaching must occupy quite a secondary place, the spread of our religion—as a Religion—by all the means in our power, being the paramount consideration.

*THE WILL AND CONSCIOUSNESS OF HUMANITY.**

Domestic, Civic, Western, Human—such is the series of associations which we must keep before us on this Festival of Humanity, the supreme term in which for our present purpose we condense both the Earth on which she works, and the sum of the external laws which constitute her Destiny. Not unmindful of the family, it is yet by some considerations on our relations as citizens of a given country, and members of the Western World, that I preface my treatment of the larger religious subject.

In substance the remarks I made last year on the state of things around us remain applicable, and will remain so for some time. Unrest and disquiet attend necessarily on the revolution in which we are moving; their form alone varies from year to year, or rather perhaps new forms arise whilst the old ones still subsist. If there is one sole remedy for the disorder, all others that may be applied are but palliative and of passing utility. They may, however, be most necessary to tide us over our great difficulties.

Such would be our judgment of the one civic question of the year which is not yet thoroughly settled, the extension of the suffrage. It is known that as Positivists we do not keenly interest ourselves in such arrangements of the parliamentary machinery, as we think government founded on parliaments an accident of the revolutionary transition, rather than a permanent institution of Humanity. But we may still accept, and even welcome, on a due consideration of our past history and present condition, such a change as that which is being wrought. For it is well to extend as far as possible the sense of citizenship, and to remove all irritation at privilege; it is well also in the complications of our most imperfect social order, that those who are most

* The commemorative form given on pp. 225, 226 applies also to this address.

responsible for its imperfections and their continuance, should feel the stimulus of the latent forces beneath them, and be aroused to a more searching and persistent examination of the existing evils and their remedies. For my own part I wish that the statesmen of both sides could have relied more on the experience of the last half century, which has shown the groundlessness of so many forebodings, and could have risen to a fuller confidence in the nation over which they preside, as well as to a juster forecast of the inevitable future. They would then have cut short the process by one act of wise courage, have got rid of the whole question by carrying their avowed policy at once to its full limits, and by giving adult manhood suffrage, have saved valuable time, and avoided the certain recurrence at no distant date of a similar agitation. There is so much beyond any suffrage question to be settled that one would be glad to see all such questions out of the way.

We should all agree, I think, as to the method by which the settlement has been reached. Whatever its bearings on our parliamentary institutions, it is a method of great promise, in the true spirit of order, and outside the range of mere party government. It does honour, if in unequal degree, to the leaders of both parties.

Two other issues have been raised in the long and we have some discussion: first, the value of a second chamber, with the changes required if the present one is in any form to continue; and secondly, the existence of the hereditary peerage, which last issue involves the larger one of hereditary distinctions. On both points opinion is evidently unsettled and has to be formed. The importance of the latter point is very great. A deeper, truer, social equality is a real want in our country, perhaps in all countries; and hereditary distinctions are one great support of the inequality which prevails, the only support perhaps of great strength at least with which it is difficult to deal—it is so rooted in our traditions and habits. And were these distinctions of less weight than they are, they yet seem out of place in an industrial society. Whereas the other source of inequality, the wealth which is not unnaturally more disliked and dreaded, is of the essence of such society, and will, when un-

supported by the former, gradually and certainly conform to its requirements.

In its external action, our country is seen to be in an anxious position. Overlook, if we will, the difficulties within the Empire, the irreconcilable hostility of Ireland, the inherent embarrassments of India, the complications in South Africa, there remains enough outside the Empire, both in East and West, to justify the statement. The burden of our encroachments is upon us, goading us by a stern nemesis to new advances, each of which discloses unexpected dangers.

Egypt, the charge of which we have undertaken avowedly, and perhaps mainly, in the interest of our Indian Empire, is the most prominent illustration of my meaning, but it is not the only one. Our colonial dependencies are leading us we can hardly see whither. Again, our sense of security is lessened; and under the pressure of alarm and imperialism, in the midst of apparent peace, the country is called on to make exertions as if war were imminent. Such seems the bearing of the cry for a large increase of our navy, a cry with which we cannot sympathise, most especially not on the alleged ground of the necessity of maintaining our exorbitant claim to maritime supremacy. Further, we are not at ease industrially nor socially, and there would seem to be a growing sense that we are unprovided with a clear-sighted and prescient statesmanship in the new conditions on which we are entering.

Those conditions regard our country as a member of the European State-system. It has ever been the aim of our Positivist policy, and none have had a more consistent policy, that England should act, more than she has of late been inclined to act, in the spirit of such membership, owning its obligations and alive to its responsibilities. She has not been of this mind, and she is being somewhat rudely recalled to her duty. In a disorderly fashion the West is forming itself to a common purpose and action, beginning to assert its collective leadership of mankind, and no one of its historical constituents can stand aloof, least of all England, in whose track the other powers are proceeding to tread in no friendly spirit. We are even confronted by the possibility of formidable combinations against us with unknown consequences.

That there is danger ahead is a general feeling; there is some considerable humiliation, as our national self-love considers it, awaits us—this also is generally felt. But beyond the danger what it may, or the humiliation, there is no reason why as Englishmen we should not rejoice at the result—be it the abandonment of the selfish isolation which has so long characterised our policy. We may welcome the recovery of our right position, the return of England to her duty as a nation, whilst we may wish she had been more self-imposed and more nobly inspired.

I do but indicate certain contingencies and probabilities. There is a strange mixture of good and evil in this colonial expansion of the West. Is it to be the industrial analogue of the mediæval crusades, cementing the union of the Western powers? or is it to intensify the prevalent distrust and disorder, the latent dislike and strong commercial jealousies which have so long underlain the superficial calm? And if so is it destined to be only one of many indirect agencies conspiring to impress on all the necessity of deep change? Again, what is to be the result on those most immediately concerned, the natives of the countries at whose expense the West is seeking to expand? There is some, at least, a weak, ground for hope in the terms used. A protectorate carries with it more sense of responsibility than accompanied by the naked occupation by virtue of greater strength. And there is a stronger ground in the mutual pressure that will be exercised by the co-presence of many powers in place of the unchecked domination of one power. But the prospect is most uncertain, the future impenetrable. It must be so in the existing spiritual interregnum. No central direction speaks yet with authority. So the rough school of experience without prevision seems fated to impose moderation on conflicting interests. The whole is a curious comment on the proud claims of our time to intellectual and moral superiority. In the eye of the calm reason of Humanity what a waste is all that we are witnessing!

Internal or external, civic or western, all considerations point to the same conclusion as last year, that the true world of this century lies outside of all political, and even of all social movements, that its one great interest is the reconstruction

tion of the spiritual guidance of Humanity. We must not shrink from reiterating this truth, and enforcing it by all the means in our power. It is our title to existence, the conviction which ennobles all our action even in its most minute details, the justification of addresses such as this which appear to accord such undue importance to what seems to many only one of the many passing efforts of our time. We do not so judge our cause, but rather as the one effort which is worth while. And our judgment is being more accepted. Without self-deceit we may say so much, without any blindness to our present weakness. That we grow in spite of this weakness is but an additional proof of the strength of that which we represent, a confirmation of our judgment.

I proceed, therefore, with confidence in the soundness of that judgment, to review in sufficient detail our year's experience, and to express my estimate of its results and of our general position at this juncture, passing thence by a natural process to the larger considerations connected with the groundwork of our whole position, and to that systematic worship of Humanity which we are, through all deficiencies and hindrances, most surely and irreversibly inaugurating.

In our special work here, there has been one change which I record with satisfaction. Our Sunday services have been continuous throughout the year. I had provided for a continuance of meetings under one form or another, but quite naturally such provision proved unnecessary, and it was found possible to adhere throughout to our usual form. That it was possible was due to the combined action of Mr. Sulman and Mr. Crompton. Others have aided from time to time, but at the critical moment in August and September their exertions prevented any intermission.

For the room in which we meet, our small church, it has been made more comfortable. I have also introduced a reading desk and a pulpit, thus carrying out more fully the intention stated in the introduction to our service of making it in form as continuous as is admissible with the religious worship around us. Both additions are as simple as they can be, but they answer their purpose. We are not by our faith encouraged to neglect outward forms, quite the contrary. Whatever decorations art can give our ritual it will accept in

the future, and such simple beginnings as are attainable should even now be welcome.

There is another change. The table which has heretofore served as a pulpit being at liberty, I have, as you see, used it for an altar. Let none shrink from the word through the force of early associations. It is a word of very ancient use and of present value. It is familiar to our pre-Protestant recollections; it has been the subject of warm controversy within the limits of Protestant churches. It has been retained in no metaphorical sense in very new connections, and in very recent times. It was, for instance, around the altar of the country that, in the early days of the French Revolution, the nation met by delegation to express what for a time was a fact—its unanimity. I have seen, said one of the survivors in our own generation, an unanimous people. Why should not we at the dawn of a larger and nobler unity introduce, as others have already done, the altar of Humanity? All around us here tells of the efforts of the past, efforts made for us and our successors. Is there any real objection to having in the midst of all this imagery of past service, some symbol which may speak to us directly of the duty of continuing those efforts, a symbol which may embody the idea of sacrifice?

Many here have made sacrifices and are ready to make greater. I acknowledge it, and feel that we cannot be too grateful to them. But need we shrink from the material outward symbol which may remind us by its presence of this great idea, and of its claims upon us? No mystery, no superstition need cleave to the symbol. It is but the assertion of the permanent human element in the term; that permanent element may stand out quite clear of such earlier notions as obscured its natural significance.

I know that the Past makes a difficulty for us. I know that those who shrink least from the essential meaning will shrink from the special symbol. But bring that special symbol to the bar of a purely human judgment, and is there any real ground to reject it? It is with this as with other ideas of the past, their retention or revival in so new a connection is a shock at first, but we soon overget it. Our faith encourages us to examine with care all that the past

offers us, whether in form or substance, to disengage the truth from what has overlain it in regard to either, and to use it, if usable, in an enlarged form, infusing into it a new spirit. The altars which in the past have been raised to the Gods of man's institution have represented beliefs, and witnessed practices, which we cannot share or adopt, but, throughout, the conception of sacrifice has clung to those altars, and as we adopt that conception in its highest sense we may well retain that which symbolises it. I need but add that sacrifice in the highest sense is for us, as it is expressed in the older language, the reasonable sacrifice of ourselves.

Generally, I think, we should as we advance be more confident. In the earlier stages of such a work as ours, hesitation was most natural; experience makes it less so. Hesitation gains in power the longer we indulge it. This is a familiar truth. In the temperate, very cautious, but consistent, development of our faith and its expression we shall, with each step gained, look back with regret and wonder on our earlier misgivings. It is at the same time quite possible that here and there added experience will lead us to change a plan adopted on what seemed at the time good grounds. The human rationality of our faith admits easily this supposition, and enables us therefore to go forward with less reluctance, as not bound by any necessity to persevere in a particular measure. This allowed, I would ask you to reflect, if you object to the new introduction, on the change which has come over many of our body in this respect, on their readiness to accept what at first repelled them. Trust me, the demand is rising for completeness in ritual, and of those who come here for the first time as Positivists by far the larger number would, I am convinced, take as quite natural and desirable any arrangements which were in accordance with that demand. Their relative faith would, moreover, be tolerant if surprised.

But the year has brought us other, and far more important acquisitions. I notice three. I. The republication by Mr. Blake of '*International Policy*,' the recent edition of which is undeniably opportune at a moment when all is in such confusion in the relations with which that work deals, the relations which are, in the judgment of our

Master, the first on which we should seek to give direction. The work has had, it is allowed to have had, a real influence on opinion ; it is now made more accessible, and its influence should be consequently wider. Its principles are recognised as not less applicable now than they were originally. It requires but to be spread, and most of us may do something to aid in its spread.

II. The Italian translation of the Catechism is at length issued by my brother, and I have every reason to think it is satisfactory as a translation. What immediate effect it will have in Italy I cannot judge, possibly it will have to wait many days. It may have one use here and elsewhere, it may render it easier for us to get a knowledge of Italian, to the spread of which we attach importance. It shows how curiously the world is connected that the value of the effort is felt first in Brazil. I have sent to Brazil at M. Lemos' request, thirty copies, as each of his co-religionists wishes for one. The ease with which one of the Latin races appropriates the language of another makes this version attractive, superseding in fact any immediate necessity for the Portuguese translation which want of funds has kept from publication.

III. We have the long-promised volume, the exceptional volume containing Auguste Comte's will, prayers, confessions, and correspondence with Clotilde de Vaux, together with such documents as he considered necessary. This last publication will be a subtle influence in the coming years, among us and around us, an influence growing with the years, and with our own growth in our religion. It is a work for the nations and for the ages to judge and use. It appeals to no single judgment. Let us bear this in mind as we read it, and be on our guard against the excessive sway of our own peculiar environment. I leave it to work its work without any more special comment.

In the main what was said last year of our whole movement in England will apply now. There has been no falling back in our several centres, but in most of them a steady growth. We have been brought more together by the continuance of the communication which I noticed last year, and by the institution of annual meetings, the first of

which was held in June. The whole course of things tends slowly to greater unity of action. For details I again refer you to a short appendix, yet not to the exclusion of a mention, as is but due, of all who are associated with us in our difficult work. The mere recital is an encouragement from the number and variety of the co-operating groups, co-operating in the largest sense we can give to the word, when it includes all who accept explicitly the direct service of Humanity as the supreme power.

Calcutta, Liverpool, Birmingham, Newcastle, and Leicester, in all of these centres we may think of similar meetings to our own on this day. In complete spiritual union with us will be also its celebration in Brazil and Chili.

And whatever our differences, there will override all differences,—am I wrong in thinking so,—more or less consciously in the other meetings which are held, wherever they are held, in Paris, London, or elsewhere, a sense of the common cause and of fellowship with all who support it. The differences will continue, but they may for the time fall into the background. Here and there, possibly, even more may be hoped for, and the nobler feeling of recognition of common service will assert itself. There are signs of the growth of such feeling. However this may be, we here omit no Positivists, whether grouped or scattered.

France, Sweden—we have had Dr. and Mrs. Nyström as its representatives amongst us; Belgium—from which again we have had a visitor, a Belgian magistrate; Italy, Hungary, Scotland, Ireland, and our Australasian colonies, North America, Russia—we have now for some weeks had among us a Russian Positivist; the list is long, and must be interpreted cautiously and without exaggeration. It is a simple statement of the fact that on so many points of the earth's surface there is a definite acceptance of the Religion of Humanity. Each single item may represent but little, there is great diversity in that respect; but the whole number has its peculiar significance, and affords us a consolation of which we need not deprive ourselves.

I do not forget the new formation in Manchester, on which, however, I speak with a reserve which, from what I have seen and heard from its members, will not be mis-

understood. It is rather indeterminate as yet and tentative; we must wait its development, and seek to understand its difficulties and its method. In its general purpose we can, at any rate, feel at one with it. It is much that in such a centre of English life the want has made itself felt of some Positivist manifestation.

On the South American Positivists I shall speak more at large in my circular.

For ourselves here, we continue very weak, much weaker than we need be. I make all due allowance for obstacles, but the one great obstacle is, after all, the defect in our resolution, due to a defective perception of the claims our Religion has upon us. The other impediments to our progress remain as they were.

We certainly want help in many ways. We want money help, but on that I have never dwelt here; and after much consideration I have determined, I hope I shall have the assent of all, not to connect this our church with any money demand whatever, to adhere to the practice we have hitherto adopted of standing clear of all offertory or other collection.

But we want help in other ways than by money, above all the help given by a real interest in the promotion of the common object. We all want a more invigorating atmosphere. Those who preach or lecture here naturally feel this want most; yet we all feel it, though we may not distinctly take account of it to ourselves. In so social a religion as ours, one saturated with the conceptions of social life and action, we all in theory recognise the action of each upon the other, of all upon each. Yet in practice we are very slack, and hence all our meetings are irregularly, often poorly attended. That this will mend I feel convinced, but we lose time and force of impact on the surrounding milieu. Much has been already lost. When a better spirit comes upon us, it will be not unaccompanied with regret. At least, that is how I feel with respect to the past.

I speak plainly on this point, for it is wise to see things as they are. But I do not feel discouraged. Such remissness and irregularity make the work harder no doubt in every way, and retard our growth. I commend this to your thought. For your own sakes I would urge more vigour of

resolve. We—I and those who work with me—have I believe adjusted ourselves to facts. And I have become aware of late years more than I was previously, and the conviction grows upon me, that we are not to be judged by results as they are seen here—that we are a central and representative organisation around which gather hope and interest in far larger measure than we think. Our audience in a word is not confined to these walls, but embraces a wide range of fellow believers, many too on whom we do not count as believers, but who yet attend to us. Our faith and persistence are bearing fruit beyond the limits of our direct vision.

And now speaking more generally, what is the impression I would wish to convey in regard to our whole movement, primarily doubtless for England, but by no means exclusively. It is now less possible than it was to treat the English movement separately. The retrospect is very encouraging—from the past and from the present I augur well. I do not ignore the drawbacks, the weakness, the divisions, the hesitations, but there is life and growth. Our indirect influence is also on the increase, and this is most important, as for some time our greatest usefulness may be in that direction, and, moreover, it is preparing the ground for us. Our direct influence is also on the increase. Our faith is getting more hold as a discipline, as a comprehensive system of duties, at the same time that it is extending its sway over the convictions of men. The former is the more valuable result.

I know that we might be much stronger than we are, but all allowance made for waste of power and opposition, I feel warranted in asserting that within the limits of the first generation—there are yet four years of it left, and think what four years may do—the Religion of Humanity has attained results far beyond what observers thought possible at its beginning; it has struck deep root, our shortcomings as disciples only evidencing more clearly its inherent strength.

In connection with these remarks, I remind you that in April next, we complete the fifteenth year of our use of this room. A special social meeting will commemorate this anniversary, not an unimportant one in the history of English Positivism.

To return. The source of that strength, what it is on which we rely, this I treated last year. But as with the central ideas of other religious systems, so with the central idea of our own, it has many aspects, each throwing light on the others, all worth our study, all tending to the same end, the just exaltation of the supreme object of our worship, belief, and service.

There has I believe of late been much discussion as to Humanity. I have no faith in controversy generally, and I offer no estimate of the value of that which has been going on. From several incidental notices I have seen reason to infer that it shows the conception to have penetrated more deeply into the thought of our time than we had anticipated, and incidentally also it demonstrates that our better opponents neither can nor wish to shake it off. So far are they from this, that regret has even been expressed by them for an understatement of its greatness. Rather do they aim at grooving it into their other notions in various ways as a support to them, or even as a better expression of them, thus facilitating that alliance of all religious minds which Auguste Comte thought so desirable, and at the same time rendering easier our own proper task, which is, as has been well said, to proclaim Humanity to men.

We need not trouble ourselves about any proof of her existence. It is the one postulate without which all that we see is unintelligible. So completely is this so, that when the postulate was not admissible, as was the case in the earlier periods of human history, a substitute had to be found—Gods or God,—either was the expression of the race's guidance. But we need no such intermediate agency now. Wherever we turn we see nothing but the direct action of man; the whole framework of our life is his work, his continuous work throughout the ages—his work unaided by any supposed power like himself though higher,—wrought out by his own exertions, using in due submission the nature around him.

Is it not so? We have but for a moment to look back and trace in thought the several constructions of man to see that it is so. Take the most visible, the most material of these constructions, the industrial result he has attained. The old simple fable of Hercules and the carter expresses

the exact truth. It is not by help from the Gods to whom he **has** prayed, but by putting his own shoulder to the wheel **that** man has created a practically new earth ; made himself **a** home where he was a stranger and on sufferance. Not **without** interest from this point of view is the old Promethean legend, where the art of man in the widest sense is represented as an encroachment upon the Gods then worshipped.

And what is true of his industrial, is true of all man's intellectual constructions. They have all been built up by **his** hard unaided labour. Art, Science, Philosophy, to all **equally** does this statement apply. It were to waste time at present to show it. Nor is it less applicable within the domain which has always been reserved more particularly for divine intervention, the conduct of human life, of nations **as** of individuals. Man's political arrangements are his own, his moral theories the fruit of his own experience ; his various religions his own creation.

Accepting this conclusion, we see a constant advance of the race in obedience to an impulse from within and in obedience to laws from without. Can we speak of that advance as *willed* ? Has Humanity a will ? It is a grave question, but we need not hesitate as to our answer. She **has**. Throughout her history it has been her will, and none other that has been done. It has been fitful, as is the will in childhood when other influences are powerful to divert us from our purpose, but in the race, as in the child, the fitfulness does not exclude growth. It has been partial, it **has** been, that is, exerted not by the whole of her organs in concert, but now by one, now by another, with a constant increase in the number brought into play. The will of the part has been slowly tending to become the will of the whole ; it **has** not yet become so in full. Hence the difficulty felt in allowing its existence for the whole. But *we* need feel no difficulty. *We* have a peculiar power placed in our hands which is not sufficiently recognised and understood, which we possibly regard with misgivings. Let us first, however, look at this will in the past a little more closely, more historically.

National unities existing for a longer or shorter period are organisms in kind like Humanity. Have such unities—the States with which we are familiar in Western history—not

had a will? Scan the history of the Jew. Is it not the record of a will, feeble at first and even intermittent, but gradually strengthening and shaping the nation in successive generations into that distinct personality which makes it now as of old a peculiar people? Is not the same true of Athens, and Carthage, and Rome, so long as they existed as imperial states? Even more to our purpose is it to trace in Greece the rise and persistence of a common purpose outside the action of any single state, the purpose which, originating in the attack of Persia, became a fact through Alexander, I mean the incorporation of Western Asia into the Greek world. I say it is more to our purpose, for here we have the combination towards a common end, the intelligent and imaginative will in fact, of more than one state, and several generations. In a higher degree, again, this is true of Rome. The deliberate march of Rome towards an aim which she early sets before her has often been commented on. The strength of her will has not been questioned. The result, it is worth observing, was the formation of a limited, a circumscribed Humanity, a true shelter for the nations it included. And the recognition of the service rendered was not wanting. I have long learnt to consider with pleasure the apotheosis of the Roman Emperor, even the worship paid to him in life, which was such a stumbling block to the Christians, and has so scandalised later writers. No doubt the homage was often paid to unworthy, most unworthy, wearers of the imperial purple. But it was the function, not the person, that was in question, and the peaceful order of which the Emperor was the impersonation was so laden with blessings, that the sound instinct of the nations led them to an unstinted gratitude.

Once more, the will of large, and, this time, independent portions of Humanity was manifested in the sway accorded to the Mediæval Church, a term which excludes the idea of any separate state. Again, there was, in fact, not in intention, a limited, a circumscribed Humanity, and with analogous results. We do not question the existence of a will in that church, working through centuries to an understood end, and in its best days worthily impersonated in the Popes. Similar results followed, unquestioning gratitude, and though in an

altered form as unmeasured adoration. The wearers of the 'great mantle' may in their turn have been singly unworthy, but their high function was not touched—for again it was the function, not the man that was in question.

Both the Roman Empires were however but types, anticipations of a future with a more stable because a more rational order, an order which shall be not circumscribed by this or that limit, but shall shelter all the nations. And when it comes, can we think that there will be any doubt as to whether we shall follow our forefathers in their feelings when we succeed them in greater blessings? It will be no question whether, but how we shall worship; how best show our grateful veneration. Can we not foretaste that future?

Here comes in what I alluded to as the peculiar advantage which our faith possesses, peculiar at any rate in degree. We have the human future shaped out and determined for us in a way in which it has never hitherto been. Cavils may be raised, but they will be silenced by a better understanding. By the aid of the past that is, we are enabled to understand all the leading tendencies of Humanity, and grasp her will in sufficient completeness to enable us to direct our efforts to its furtherance. That will has gradually moved onwards to greater power and steadiness, even when the goal was unseen, or, at most, dimly seen. Now that it is full in sight, we may count on a quicker rate of motion. The revelation of Humanity was not possible till these latter days. Once revealed, she becomes indeed 'a being of a large discourse looking before and after.' We can, that is, trace her will in its formation, see it at work throughout her whole life as we now view that life. As her life was hid in the past, so her will, her direction, was nominally vested in others, was also hid so far as she was directly in question; but as we can see that she has always, though veiled, been the only real power, so we can see that her will has been the only real will. And as in the Past so most surely in the Future, for the revelation of her includes her future. It displays the impressive, indivisible unity of Humanity. And it is easy by imagination to form some idea of what her will will effect when it shall have attained full recognition.

Is Humanity conscious? Though what I have said

answers this question implicitly, I may say plainly—She is. But as with her will so with her consciousness. It is a growing, advancing, hitherto an imperfect, consciousness. In its earlier stages so obscured as to be practically non-existent, it has gradually, very gradually, been wakened into fuller life. It is even now far distant from its full term. Long time has been needed to develop its germs, and the development is still but the germ of what it will be. Here, again, one of the many partial organisms which are in all essential features like her may throw light on the point. Is England conscious? None would deny that England has a will. There might be more hesitation as to her consciousness from a fear of the consequences of its admission. Yet we must I think admit it. It is but an imperfect consciousness; but from the beginning of her history, and we can be present at the beginning of English history, we can follow down through the generations an advancing consciousness, and advancing at an ever accelerating rate. All our language testifies to it. Her so-called constitution, with its much-admired gradations in growth; the traditions of England; the policy of England; are they not all terms stamped with the impress of a conscious will? Why not apply the same judgment to the whole as to the part? It is, as a fact, being so applied, superseding all discussion. We hear constant appeals to public opinion, the public opinion no longer of Europe merely, but of all nations. Its power is greatly overrated at present, but there it is, a real power; and what is it at bottom but a form of the consciousness of Humanity.

But if will and consciousness are functions of Humanity, what is their organ, or what is the organ of her conscious will, for I have only separated for a passing purpose what are really inseparable terms in the connection in which they are here used. The answer is clear that the organ required is the present, the actual living, generation, the connecting link between those which have passed away and those which are coming on. As surely as we each of us are to-day the organ of our individual conscious will, our past and properly our future aiding in its determination, but our present only being in our power, so surely for the collective organism in

its widest extension is each generation in turn its conscious will, a most powerful will, an expanding consciousness, swayed by its past, impelled by its future, but mistress only of the present. The generation that is is invested for its time with the full power of Humanity. It decides the questions submitted to it, it acts as the heir of all that has been, as the trustee for all that is to be. It may abuse its inheritance, it may be untrue to its trust, or it may be a faithful and true servant in its days, but it has full competence, none can question its power, though it cannot elude its responsibility.

I have said enough I think to place before you the leading idea that Humanity is a being with will and consciousness, with a most gradual advent to power, a being even yet imperfectly developed, and consequently unable to make her will felt as it will be felt; consequently also not enlightened as she will be enlightened by her mature and full consciousness. It is this imperfection that explains the difficulty many honestly find in realising the conception, whether of her being or her attributes. It is the reality of the conception which explains the rapidity with which it was matured, and with which indeed it has spread, one generation sufficing for the former process; what has passed of a second witnessing the latter. Before the close of the second generation, that is, of our positive era, we are turning from the City of God to the Humanity which stands out in its fair proportions made visible to our ken; whereas it was not till the opening of the fifth century of the Christian era, that the greatest doctor of the early Christian Church found it possible to delineate the City of God which was to rise upon the ruined fabric of Imperial Rome.

But it is to the imperfection that I recur, for that brings me to those practical considerations which are always most profitable. How can we aid in drawing out the consciousness of Humanity? How can we make her will more effectual? What can we do to secure both the one and the other against all dispute? Evidently by the strengthening of all such centres as we have and by the formation of new ones. As in different and distant lands there arise such centres of believers in her, setting forth her existence, and

showing their belief in her reality, both in the past and future, by paying her the same homage as has been paid to the viceregents whom she has from time to time chosen, the consciousness of which we have been speaking is aroused and extended. And such centres may well be individuals, that I feel strongly. There may be, there are, some who stand alone in the midst of a population which cannot accept their teaching. Yet that teaching and the life which embodies it, are none the less a powerful influence, which will, so propitious is the time, most assuredly be a fertile seed. Where the centre is not an individual but a group, there the action should be more rapid and stronger, drawing more into the circle, quickening attention outside. But the difference is in degree only, except as concerns the manifestation of the religious life. He who stands alone must depend on his life only for the evidence of his faith. They who can act in concert may do more.

Herein lies the justification of joint worship in however rudimentary a form; the justification of our persistence here in its definite institution. The meetings held elsewhere to-day concede the principle. Our practice in this and kindred centres only carries it out in more completeness. Both are a notice to those who surround us that there has arisen a new Religion—claiming on a new basis the obedience of men; both are a proclamation of Humanity—a direct preaching of her which will be listened to.

Worship—yes, we want worship in a most definite form, ever growing to goodlier proportions. We want no humble, no ambiguous, no half recognition of the Power we serve. It is boldness that is required, and the greater the boldness the wiser will the event show it. It may be called fanaticism—it is so called I believe. I care not. 'Fanaticism is respectable,' said Comte to me one day. 'A certain dose of it,' as Mr. Geddes once observed to me, 'would be no evil among us.' But in truth there is no fanaticism in the case. We rest for our practice of worship on the basis of calmest truth, on solid historical, on solid scientific ground—our conclusions are warranted by well ascertained laws of our social and moral being.

Such qualifications of this language as the dominant

critical attitude suggests, you will supply for yourselves.

The need for due caution, &c., I recognise fully. But our danger, here, in this centre, does not lie in the direction of over-boldness. What I wish to insist on is the value even **i**mp~~er~~fect common worship has for those who join in it, and **a**s an evidence to the world generally. I do not entertain a **d**oubt but that its existence is a growing source of strength—**t**hat its extension to new centres would be the speediest mode **o**f extending the ascendancy of our religion—that by its action **o**n the worshippers it increases the number of those who will **h**elp in giving efficacy to the will of Humanity, whilst **i**nherently and by the nature of the case, it deepens and widens **t**he consciousness of Humanity.

The subject opens other vistas in profusion, but I have said enough for the present. For me, or for those who come after me, there will be other opportunities of drawing on its inexhaustible suggestiveness.

But we must not content ourselves now with the direct preaching of Humanity, with the setting forth so far as we are able the power and beauty of the truth we hold. We must face the practical difficulties which lie before us.

We are confronted with the inexorable question: Has the religion you preach motive power? So far as we have yet gone, we have no reason to doubt it. The world around us, and this is true of all countries in varying degree, is not with us, the beliefs of men and yet more their unbelief are against us. We have no reason to complain of this—no reason again to complain, speaking generally, of the reception we are meeting. As yet, it is kindly and tolerant enough. Still there must be strong opposition, and the adoption of a faith which, however unaggressive in its method, radically supersedes the old, must bring penalties at first—penalties of various kinds, and influencing differently different minds, but combining their effect to discourage fresh adhesions, to keep back avowals of those given. Again, merely as new, without any reference to penalties, our faith requires time to enlist the feelings and convictions of men on its side. It must therefore at its origin be weak in point of numbers. The force of possession is against us, all the conservative forces are against us, and so peculiar is our position, all or nearly

all, the revolutionary forces are against us, as are also the traditional instincts, which are stronger than any definitely stated beliefs, and which find expression in the personal interests of the immense majority. This numerical weakness is in itself a powerful hindrance; would be so at all times, is so more particularly at a time when, through the weakness of convictions, and consequently of characters, the gregarious tendencies of men have undue ascendancy. Yet, in the face of all these depressing circumstances, we have seen that our Religion has grown; that alone, or with others, converts are being made under such diverse conditions, as to exclude any other supposition than that they are due to the intrinsic attractions of that which they accept. It offers in a word no temptation but itself. Its acceptance, then, even in this very limited degree has in it a wealth of promise, is so far a satisfactory answer to the implied objection that the system is inadequate to its avowed object.

For all beyond this there is no answer possible, the future alone can answer it. All that can be said is that we can contribute in our day to shape that answer of the future. We do not doubt what it will be—in that we are complete. Are we complete in our sense of, in our discharge of, our own present responsibilities? We have the conviction that what we avouch as our religious faith has the power in it to triumph over all opposition and range the world on its side. Are we translating this speculative truth into act? The very strength of our system and our confidence in that strength seem to weaken us. We trust it too much to itself. We are unwise in this and too little mindful of the effect on others of our mistake. These, and similar points I leave to your own reflections. I have strong upon me the feeling that throughout the body to which, by my position, I speak, under all our shortcomings, reflection is gathering weight, and is leading to coherence of purpose, to firmness in execution. The power of the past is in and upon us; we have not to construct a past as the Christians had—a past of our own. What was their peculiar weakness is our peculiar strength. Humanity knows no breach in her traditions. Her past is our past. It is our own fault if, by virtue of the same property in her, the power of the future is

not in us and upon us, if the loving service to which the Future calls us be not a force of equal constraint with the loving obedience we give to the Past. For on us, as on our fathers, there rests a constraint ; and to us, as to them, that constraint is love, the principle remaining the same under a different form. The personal Christ they loved has past away for us, the want of something larger has grown upon men ; the demand has been met ; the Christ that is to be, the social Christ, stands revealed to us ; we are face to face with Humanity.

One word more. Our Christian forefathers tended more and more to swerve from the divine to the human, from the Christ to his Virgin Mother. We accept in full, in its spirit, the heritage they have left us, making such changes only as are necessitated by a faith which is throughout wholly human. For us the Virgin Mother and Humanity are one.

DANTE. *Par.* xxxiii., 1-22.

O Virgin Mother, daughter of thy Son !
 Created beings all in lowliness
 Surpassing, as in height above them all ;
 Term by the eternal counsel pre-ordain'd ;
 Ennobler of thy nature, so advanced
 In thee, that its great maker did not scorn
 To make himself his own creation ;
 For in thy womb rekindling shone the love
 Reveal'd, whose genial influence makes now
 This flower to germin in eternal peace,
 Here thou to us, of charity and love,
 Art as the noon-day torch ; and art, beneath,
 To mortal men of hope a living spring.
 So mighty art thou, Lady, and so great,
 That he who grace desireth, and comes not
 To thee for aidance, fain would have desire
 Fly without wings. Not only him who asks
 Thy bounty succours, but doth freely oft
 Forerun the asking. Whatso'er may be
 Of excellence in creature—pity mild,
 Relenting mercy, large munificence—
 Are all combined in thee.

THE ANNUAL ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE

CHURCH OF HUMANITY, 19 Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C.,

on the Festival of Humanity 97 (1 January, 1885).

APPENDIX.

THE POSITIVIST MOVEMENT.

In many quarters there is little to be noted. There is a slight increase of number in India. So far as I know, in the United States we are in a stationary condition. In South America the two centres of Brazil and Chili are in active correspondence with me. The establishment of this correspondence was most unexpected and for many reasons most welcome.

My visit to Scotland in the spring showed me that I had not been mistaken in the estimate I gave last year, either as to the breaking up of the old faith or the gradual preparation for the new. Still, we may have to wait some time before anything like a definite organisation is formed in Edinburgh or elsewhere. It would be most natural that it should arise in Edinburgh, but there is considerable activity of thought in other towns, and we may have it where we least look for it.

Of the English centres, what I said last year holds good this. There has been steady persistence in Liverpool, and quiet growth. In Birmingham progress is slower, and there is more difference of opinion as to the method to be adopted, as there is less readiness outside to see what the new religion offers. Yet there is great personal cordiality and social feeling. The slowness of movement is trying to those who are engaged in it, but there is a sufficient beginning to work upon, and we have time before us. In Newcastle I found that there had been a very decided advance. All is on a better, more hopeful footing there, and year by year Mr. Quin finds himself better supported and able to extend his operations. In Sunderland I found all unchanged. The attitude of the Free Associate church was the same—the

friendliness the same. Leicester, as Newcastle, has advanced, if not much in numbers, in its unity of purpose and action. There is no hesitation in giving the movement its full religious character. Of Manchester I have spoken in the body of the address. The only fresh opening in the year was at Cambridge, where I ventured, at the wish of friends, to give a lecture on the Religion of Humanity. The results of such ventures must be uncertain, but as our cause gets more of a hearing there is more likelihood of a definite result. With or without result, it is a duty to take what opportunities offer.

In London, the new centre in North London, of which I spoke last year has had vicissitudes. As it was when I spoke of it it soon came to an end, as was natural, where there had been evidently a wide interval between the avowed and the real intention. There continues, however, I believe, a North London centre in connection with Newton Hall. I see it is stated to be in full vigour, but the exact value of such an expression is not easy to determine. Time will show what it is.

To be true to facts, I must add that the year has been marked by an increase of hostility to our method, so far as we can argue from the language used by the official representative of Newton Hall. I cannot say—I may have doubts—how far he represents the prevailing feeling, but the fact remains. Here, again, we must leave the question to time. We adhere to our own view, and seek to carry out our method to its full logical conclusions.

I avail myself of this opportunity to look forward a little, and speak on what we have in prospect. We have no call to hurry on changes. At the same time, we should be aware that there is very much to be done in the way of giving our action greater completeness. I find a general readiness to acknowledge this, and would, so far as I can, give expression to such a disposition.

In the present year, then, I propose certain additions:—

1. A slight increase in the number of our social meetings, so as to have practically one in each month of the Positivist year. I say practically, for in August and September, the two evening meetings will be the equivalent of the ordinary

social meetings for those two months, as the Annual Meeting on the Festival of Humanity is the equivalent of an ordinary social meeting for the first month of the year.

159 2. I think the time has come for instituting the second festival indicated in the fourth volume of the 'Positive Politics' (p. 357 E. Tr.), as in close connection with the Festival of Humanity, which has now for many years been celebrated with the full consent of all Positivists. With due respect for our local tradition, the mediæval church's Festival of the Virgin Mother, the Festival of the Assumption on August 15th, may have its analogue in the worship of the Religion of Humanity, as a part of that worship during the Transition. We have been long familiar with the mediæval type as the 'spontaneous idealisation' of Humanity. propose very cautiously to strengthen our recognition of it and to turn it to fuller use.

THE POWER OF HUMANITY.*

It is not easy in the restless agitation of the hour, which will intrude upon us, do what we will, to keep the calmness of judgment requisite for a right estimate of the relative importance of the questions under discussion in which we cannot but take interest. There is a feeling, perhaps it is not unshared by some here, that we, the disciples of the Religion of Humanity, stand too much aloof from the present; that we are too indifferent to the actual political and social movements; that we are deficient in citizenship, in civic feeling. It is not so—we are in nowise indifferent—we only differ from many of those around us in our relative estimate and in the method we adopt for exerting such influence as we may possess. We seek to remember steadily that our true function, for the present, is to act on opinion, not to take part in action as a body—whilst we make all allowance for the varied requirements of individual cases. Without therefore letting ourselves be disturbed by the impatient calls to share in this or that of the thousand minor efforts which are being made all around us, we hold on our way in a wise abstention, centering our care and action on our own acknowledged duty: the promotion of the great religious change within us and around us which is the one essential want of mankind. As instrumental in furthering such change we set before others, as best we may, the effects which would follow were it worked out, or we anticipate those effects with a view to the guidance of the present. In short we, as others, choose our own method of procedure. In the rush of conflicting demands a choice is imperatively demanded. But I repeat it, we are not indifferent spectators, we act in our own way and where we think we can act most usefully.

* The commemorative form given on pp. 225, 226, applies also to this address.

We share the common belief that opinion governs in the end, and we address ourselves to its guidance; in a word, we would constitute a central organ of opinion. This is the task of every spiritual power, and we claim to be a collective spirituality. The claim brings with it an obligation; the obligation not to endanger the impartiality which should characterise all that we say by mixing in the conflict. For all reasons it seems that we should as at present stand out of the competition for a share in power, so to keep our influence the purer. This is the general principle, with due allowance, I repeat, for circumstances. And in our present condition as a distinct body it is the more politic course. If we mix in the competition we excite a more bitter opposition, and that unnecessarily, not in the support of any great interest, and we divert others from the quieter examination of our system by the angry passions we awaken. This language does not exclude the free and quiet exercise of such powers as our citizenship gives us; it holds as against the becoming ourselves the depositaries of power. The clearer we stand the more useful we shall be, whatever may be said under the chaotic impulses of the present.

It so happens that even in the immediate present the political questions which are for our statesmen the most urgent, and which appear so to the general mind, are most urgent to us. For instance, the one consideration which appears likely to absorb for some time the practical statesmanship of this country is, stated in its most comprehensive form, the question of imperial unity. For the moment it is narrowed to an exclusive reference to Ireland, and may be so narrowed possibly for a period; but it has larger applications, and they will force for themselves a hearing. Not directly involved in the issues submitted to the new electoral body in Great Britain, we find, now that the contest is over, this imperial question overriding all others. Whatever the expectations from the change in the electorate as to improved government at home, they must wait, it would seem, till some settlement for Ireland has been agreed upon. For Ireland's power for obstruction is great, her demands imperious, and not to be set aside without full discussion.

It is not my purpose now to speak on the settlement of

Ireland. I rather wish to insist on a prior point; on this, viz.: that for any settlement the decisive power lies in opinion; all depends on what it is, on what it may become under the enlightening influence of certain fresh facts. It is not on mere voting powers that such matters turn. The voting power will in the end register the conclusion which the thought of the country shall have reached, or which those shall have reached who are responsible for the policy of the country, and who have its confidence. If we are co-operating then in forming this conclusion, or in giving it force, supposing it to be such as we can admit; or if we are guiding opinion to another conclusion, supposing we think the one generally received erroneous; in either case we are not open to the charge of indifference.

So it is again in the question which holds the next place in importance, if we would be true to the imperial obligations we have contracted by our past: I mean the question of the right conduct of Great Britain towards India. Again, that is, the appeal lies to opinion, in this sense: that on its swaying this way or that decisively, will depend the action of the ruling power. Not the settlement of the difficulties. For observers are more and more recognising that we have a time allowed us in which we may effect the settlement, or at least establish the principles on which, by a cautious gradual process, it may be wisely effected; but that the opportunity is slipping away, and the decision may come from the second of the high contracting parties—from India, and not from England. This by the way; for here again I do not wish to enter on the proper merits of the Indian question, but rather to confine myself to pointing out that they who, year by year, on all fitting occasions, do what they can to mould opinion into the form which they think the best, are not indifferent, are not in any way standing aloof from their duties as citizens.

Nor would I accept the charge in relation to home questions. Look closely into these questions—examine them with a due respect to both order and progress—attaching more weight, as our Positive political system enjoins, to order than to progress, and we shall see reason for the adoption of the same attitude. In so far as they are political even, the truest action is for us outside the Parliamentary sphere,

apart from the ballot box and the assembly which it makes. Three of the most prominent questions of the day are : public instruction, the land, and the relations of Church and State. The first is only provisionally and unfortunately a State question. On the two others, the peaceful and enduring arrangements which can alone deserve the name of a settlement, will not be reached, and not be susceptible of a record in legislative form, till there is much more agreement than there is at present as to the grounds of arrangement. It may illustrate this to observe that whereas in Wales the settlement of the church question might be at once decisive as opinion is decided, in England it cannot be so, for it is most evident that opinion here is undecided ; so much so as to make any strong action impracticable.

If in home matters we look deeper, and following the confessed tendency of the times, consider the social issues as far more important than the political, we find ampler justification for not involving ourselves in what seem the more practical movements of the day—for not aiming at immediate results through direct political action. This may be a source of present weakness. That evil we must face, but remain true to and act upon our conviction that the appeal does not lie to direct legislative interference, but to a quickening of social feeling and the purifying of our moral judgments under the inspiration of a religion. Such a conviction is no sign of indifference.

But enough on these separate aspects of the problem of present conduct. Those who see in religion, be it in the older form as most think, or in the newer form as we think, but in one form or the other, the only real source of the changed order of the future, are, in their endeavours either to breathe new vigour into the old or to establish the new, engaged more or less deeply, as their zeal or their opportunities differ, in the one real work which can be of permanent use. All else is but temporary and palliative—more immediately attractive, perhaps, but offering no real satisfaction to the intelligence or the heart. From this vantage ground they will work as effectually as others in the solution of the actual difficulties, but they will work with less absorption, with a juster sense of proportion, with a greater

freedom from excitement. Such are the conclusions on this subject, on political and social indifference, which I offer for your consideration.

Now for a few words on some of the larger interests of the present. The disquiet of the world, both in West and East, continues unabated, requiring the constant application of temporary remedies. We cease not as a country to contribute our share to its increase. I noticed last year the inclination of Western Europe to colonial expansion under various incitements, but most under the incitement of commercial aggrandisement. It is hard to see how the good will counterbalance the palpable evils of this movement. Our own country's most objectionable contribution is the conquest of Burmah. The act is consummated to-day. The incorporation of Burmah into the empire is announced in a Queen's proclamation. It is an ill-omened New Year's gift, this seizure of a new Naboth's vineyard so long coveted. In itself it is morally without justification and politically dangerous, but I speak of it here as stimulating and strengthening by example the colonial aspirations of other states. For us, as for all the states our compeers in the West, there is over and above all the moral objections to the course, the double disadvantage of misdirecting the resources of each state and diverting attention from much higher interests, viz., from wise internal government and the peaceful organisation of the West as a collective guide for mankind. The neglect of these higher interests leaves the West most sensitive to all the disturbing influences which abound, and the consequence is that great as are the efforts to secure peace the feeling of insecurity predominates, the insecurity in each separate state intensifying the feeling as regards the whole.

The general industrial pressure in the Western world is partly result, partly cause, of this inner insecurity—more remotely but not less certainly of the outer. The waste of material resources of all kinds, the diverting from its true use the intellectual wealth of mankind, the perversion of moral feelings, all increase the disorganisation of industry and forbid any valuable inquiry into, any deep searching examination of the means which might remove it. Un-

remedied it must continue fraught with danger—a danger proportionate to the greater or less identification of any given state with the industrial life.

I mention these two aspects of the anarchical condition of the West, the colonial and the industrial, mainly to draw attention to this question: Do they admit of any adequate treatment on the methods at present in use, or on the methods generally proposed as substitutes? And as the answer must, I think, be that they do not, we come round to our former conclusion that in a quiet gradual reconstruction under the inspiration of a religion lies the sole issue for the human race out of its present uncertainty and suffering.

Under this impression I turn to a review of the past year, as a fresh link in the chain of our effort towards this gradual reconstruction. I would in no way disguise the weakness of that effort, nor underrate the forces which impede it, but at the same time I am not less certain of its ultimate value.

I would remind you, then, that there has again been no interruption during the year of our Sunday work. The help needed for this has been ungrudgingly given. In other respects also our action has been sustained throughout. The religious meetings announced have taken place; the new festival has been inaugurated; several of the social sacraments have been administered. For so small a body these sacraments have been numerous this last year, and in their character of great importance. The social meetings and the monthly meetings of the Positivist Society have been held, the former with increased frequency. The annual conference could not meet at the time originally proposed, but when it met, it was, taking all the circumstances into account, well attended. In our Church itself, this room in which we meet, there are some slight changes. We have the altar in due form and we have some increase of ornament. I explained last year in what light I regarded the altar. I proposed to introduce it as a symbol of sacrifice, of sacrifice on our part in each succeeding generation, in fitting response to the sum of sacrifices by which we have what we have, are made what we are. As such symbol it has been by most accepted. For any ornament that has been added in com-

pletion no defence is needed. There is no hidden meaning in our ornaments. They are but a sign of the feeling common to us all that we should do whatever we can to make the room more beautiful, more adequate as an expression of our willing and cheerful service of Humanity.

We owe to Mr. and Mrs. Henry Crompton a photograph of St. Louis, taken from a statue in Rheims Cathedral. Two other additions I notice. First the mural tablet in memory of Dr. Baxter, which a joint effort of those who knew him and his worth intimately, has enabled me to place near the others. It is, like the others, quite simple. Our dead lie widely scattered; these simple monuments bring them together, and place us in their presence when we can hardly visit their graves. They connect us with our immediate past, and consecrate by sacred memories this room and our continuous work. The second addition is meant to repair an omission which has too long existed. In the temples of the future there are to be fourteen chapels—the fourteenth dedicated to Holy Women. We have had from the beginning a representation of thirteen, the busts and portraits of their occupants serve this purpose if the chapel form is unattainable. But the fourteenth chapel has been without any recognition. I have thought it desirable to have a partial recognition, which may be completed later. The bracket which stands behind and over the bust of Auguste Comte answers this purpose, and at the same time as unoccupied it indicates a want. The bust of Heloïse as the type of supreme womanly tenderness and self-devotion will one day meet this want. This addition is appropriate to the year which has witnessed the first celebration in England of the festival of woman, in connection with the Virgin-Mother of our Christian predecessors.

I take this occasion to remark that the defective arrangement of the other busts should be amended, when a repainting of the room gives us the opportunity. The series should lead up from Moses to Charlemagne on the right as we enter, from Dante to Holy Women on the left.

For convenience sake I have put all the separate parts of our action together. I return on one point, on the social sacraments which I mentioned. We justly attach the

greatest importance to this part of our work, in itself and because of its prospective character. We have had two presentations, one of peculiar interest, because it was combined with an adoption, as binding an adoption as our laws permit. The Sacrament of Admission was conferred on one who was taking on herself a very definite service of Humanity, by becoming a nurse. Lastly, three of our members have asked for and received the Sacrament of Destination. Two of the three were formally destined for the Priesthood. We speak of discouragements and consequent depression, and we so speak in accordance with facts. We may set in the balance such an act as this, by which two men in early manhood, fully acquainted with all our conditions, quite able to count the cost, with very different intellectual and social antecedents, testified their acceptance of, their confidence in, our religious future, and faced the arduous task of preparation for the priestly function. The third case was a very peculiar one. I may say briefly here that it was that of a Russian Positivist who, bound—self-bound—to a determination to spread the Religion of Humanity among his countrymen, asked for a sacramental sanction to his office, whereby he might feel the support of religious membership and of the sympathy of his co-religionists. We all felt the deep significance of such an act in one who had given already such proofs of his devotedness.

I received last night a letter from Mr. Frey, which I shall take an early opportunity of making known to you all. My limits now permit me only an extract, which indicates in what spirit it is written: 'With the approach of our yearly Festival of Humanity, says Mr. Frey, when we, both privately and collectively, reflect over the accomplishment of the past years, and over the problems which are left undone, I think my report of what I have found in Russia, and how far I (have) succeeded in propaganda of our religion, will be a proper supplement to the other reports of the same kind. I wish that it may reach you on the day of our great festival as a token of my spiritual union with the Church of Humanity.'

I would place in close juxtaposition with these sacra-

ments, the three commemorations or funeral services, which we have had in the year—during which time our losses have been quite out of proportion to our numbers. Such ceremonies have a sacramental character. All three have been deeply sorrowful, for each has been a tribute to a great loss socially, to many a most intimate personal loss. Nor are the three all. In Calcutta we were deprived in the beginning of the year, by an accident, of a new Hindoo adherent of great promise. It is the saddest thing, this succession of deaths under which we move forward to the accomplishment of our work in premature bereavement.

In connection with the room and its arrangements, I may express the wish that it could be more used, especially for lectures, giving applications of our doctrine to the more important questions of the day. No smallness of our audience ought to prevent our having these when we are able. Besides this I could wish it were in our power to have it permanently open and warmed. As it is on Saturday afternoons it is open and warmed, and any of our members can use it for reading or meditation or social converse. Such informal use of it might be profitable.

None, I think, can enter the room as it is and not see that it is consecrated to a religious worship—the worship of Humanity, through the grateful commemoration of her Past, through the idealisation of her Future, to the cultivation of our devotion to her in the Present. All the additions made have aimed at impressing this character upon it. Our religious services should deepen this impression, as by the enforcement of our duties they should lay a solid ground for the feelings which we express. For their expression we have been content with something very simple, and on a careful survey of our actual state as a movement, to this simple form I think we shall be wise to adhere for the present, content with the essential. The direction in which a gradual advance is most to be wished, is towards a greater community of expression by means of forms of prayer in which all could join, and by hymns sung by all. But whilst I would suggest this, I feel we can wait till the way is clearer than it seems at present. With regard to the hymns, I see that there are reasons for not

being impatient, that there is division of opinion as to what and how we are to sing, even as to whether we should introduce singing at all. On the strictly musical point I am wholly incompetent. On the other, I can only repeat that I am ready and willing, whenever it shall be thought possible, to introduce congregational singing, for that it should be congregational is to my mind a necessary condition.

Provided that we have attained the essential object, which is a common religious expression of our life's service, we may be very patient, very cautious as to what we do next. In regard to the forms we adopt, our position here imposes certain obligations. It may be well for me, as entrusted by your confidence with the common direction, to say how I regard those obligations, on what principle we have acted, and as yet must act. We are here at the centre of English religious Positivism. From hence have originated all the efforts made in England to present the new faith as a religion in the generally received sense of the word; as not merely a doctrine, nor even a doctrine issuing in a life, but also as a worship. Nor is our action confined to England, as we know. The simplest form compatible with our aim was chosen originally, as was necessary, and it should not be forgotten that the object, and even the form, had the cordial assent of all English Positivists. It is incumbent on us as the common centre of initiative, and I would add, as of necessity by our local position the centre of the English branch of the Church of Humanity, to be most careful in our action on this point, never to lose sight of the fact that there are several other centres, each with a peculiar environment, and each, therefore, demanding consideration of its circumstances and requirements; moreover, that fresh centres, similarly situated, may arise at any moment and may look to us for counsel or example. There is a strong social reason then why we here should proceed cautiously, and on the whole simply, with as great simplicity as is consistent with the assertion of our principle, avoiding what may be difficulties to others even when to us they might not be difficulties, taking no step which may have to be recalled, not prejudging the future growth, but waiting for the light which our growing needs will throw upon the whole subject. There has been here, I may add

with truth, the strongest wish throughout to watch for the spontaneous advance of our body, to begin when its members were ready for beginning, to accept their impulse, so the better to carry their convictions with us in such forward movement as it was thought wise to risk. Where it was absolutely necessary to take a step of myself I have not hesitated—in all else I have waited.

A richer, warmer ceremonial will come; this is most certain to any who image to themselves, however faintly, the festivals of the future Church. Even in the present all shows that the tendency is in that direction. No doubt we suffer in the eyes of some from the want of the richer ceremonial, though there are many whom it does not attract. But it exists all around us, and the churches which still wield so much power and have such resources at their disposal, are wisely directing their energy to its increase. Wisely, both for their own proper objects and in the interests of the common future, they are resting more than they were wont on cultural influences and on all the beautiful accessories of worship. Their success weighs on our efforts. They offer, I mean, so much more in regard to such accessories than we can offer, that they keep with them those who might be from the state of their belief drawn to us. We must submit to the stern necessity of our circumstances and see what strength we can derive from that necessity. We are at the beginning of a new order and must endure without impatience the inconveniences of beginning. We have small resources, we cannot have numbers, we are forming, not living under a long accumulation of associations and traditions. But all is not in favour of the older churches; far from it. There co-exists in them, with all the splendour of their worship, with this ritual growth, a growing unsoundness of the foundations on which they rest; there is a sense of unreality about them from the decay of belief, whereas under all our poverty of appearance we rest on a growing reality, on a rising not a decaying faith. The intelligent belief of the age, its moral cravings are working for us—sooner or later an ample compensation for the difficulties we acknowledge.

We assert our claim to borrow freely from our predecessors, as they borrowed from theirs. We assert our claim, that is,

to use for our purposes the accumulated spiritual treasures of the Past, as the common property of mankind. Only we must be cautious in the process, lest we overlay our own proper contribution, obscure the new truth which we have to offer, or go beyond the point which our religious feeling has reached, so importing a measure of unreality. The second caution goes deeper into our action. Our adoption must be a careful revision. The adoption will be mainly from the mediæval Catholicism. It will be necessary to weigh well our differences from that system. You will understand me on this very difficult subject to be rather throwing out matter for consideration than attempting to prescribe any rules. It all resolves itself into this, that we have reached a period of our existence as a community which if it requires boldness in essentials, requires great prudence in details, that our policy must be at once very firm and very tentative.

I quite accept, we all perhaps accept, what has been urged on me, that in the actual state of Positivism there should be the largest mutual tolerance of all efforts, the greatest fellow-feeling with exertions akin to our own if different in form; that the vastness of the construction which has been begun for us, but which has been handed over to us unfinished, dwarfs us all; that we can severally contribute but partially to working it out; that as the master-mind which grasped the whole is withdrawn from us, and we have no complete living teacher to guide and unify our work, we have to accommodate ourselves to the almost inevitable consequence: the independence, viz., of the various efforts; that we must look on the totality of those efforts as our real working power in the world; must, in the strictest sense, recognise for the time a collective action. Whilst ready to accept this in the main, I see that as far as possible we should foster interdependence, and make it our rule to consult in common, at any rate wherever from agreement in principle consultation seems natural. Perhaps there is too little of this consultation, less than there might well be. It would increase our strength were there more of it. We must wait, however, for this conviction to grow; all our antecedents, all our conditions, are unfavourable to its growth.

The facts as to the Positivist community, in the widest

extension of the term, whether in England or elsewhere, are much the same as they were last year; at least, so far as I know, there is not any marked change, nor has any new centre been formed. All the groups then enumerated remain, unless Sweden be an exception, which I hope it is not. Several of the groups have suffered the heaviest losses, but the wholes remain. The same holds good of isolated Positivists—I have nothing to add or subtract. Again, the general judgment then given on our action and cohesion, both here and elsewhere, will apply now. What I then said of our influence as well indirect as direct, I might repeat in substance to-day. It becomes more evident each year that our indirect influence is, for our country and time, by far the more powerful of the two. This may console us for the weakness of our direct growth, whilst it should teach us to strengthen it as much as possible, for it is certain that there will be a proportion between the two.

In respect of our own advance, if I am not greatly mistaken, there is to be traced under all our differences more union in spirit, as I anticipated last year. It is a pleasure to recognise it and to acknowledge any manifestation of it. It is not in the least likely immediately to set aside those differences, though it may have an outlook in this direction. It is due to a firmer grasp of the religious element proper in the Positivist system, to an increased perception that the system appeals and should appeal, to the feelings more than to the intellect, and that it should act on the conduct, not be limited to a change of convictions. As a natural consequence more interest is awakened in the worship in all its divisions, perhaps most of all in the personal worship on which the others depend for their life and vigour. If the observation is correct, it is ground for encouragement. Our internal difficulties hamper our progress; more inward union, however little on the surface, must lessen them. It is the guarantee of more outer, of which it is also the only safe basis.

So that as a whole I come to the conclusion to which I came last year—that there is a sound if a very slow progress. New, unsolicited, and unexpected, adhesions confirm this judgment. The value of such adhesions is enhanced by the conviction that they are representative; that what has acted

on some with sufficient force to make them openly join us, is acting on others to change their opinions. I have seen instances lately of the inclining towards us of some whom from what I knew of them in past years I should have thought most unlikely ever to approach us. The seed-time of a great cause is a demand on our patience—we would so gladly see the harvest. We must rest on our reasonable faith that the harvest is sure, and will be abundant.

Resting on the general and comforting conclusion which I have stated, I would, before I enter on the reasons for our tempered confidence, express for us all here the sympathy we feel for all who share our expectation and our faith, for all who on this day will with us, singly or in company, bring the tribute of their homage to the Humanity whom they all acknowledge. Our thoughts will pass to all of them in succession, in varying order as we may vary in our interest or knowledge. As the most distant, but in many respects the most interesting, I mention first the Calcutta centre as the first fruits of that union of the East and the West which its formation inaugurates—then the Brazilian and Chilian groups, together with the scattered Positivists in the United States and in Australasia, as the representatives of the colonial expansion of Europe. From the adherents of the new order in the different countries of Europe in which they are found, and they are found in most, I spare you the list, I come to those who are working in the common cause, whether with us or apart, in Ireland, Scotland, and England—with distinct mention of the two other groups in London, of the Manchester society, of the Liverpool centre, and those in Birmingham, Leicester, and Newcastle, who are in most intimate communion as centres with us here. If it is impossible to name or address our isolated fellow disciples, they are not the less, so far as known, present to our thoughts, their isolation constituting a stronger claim to such support as the assurance of our not forgetting them may give. The social character of our religion explains and justifies the foregoing remarks.

I spoke just now of a reasonable faith; such it is, for we have a great power behind us. I would say something of this power, the power vested in Humanity, by virtue of her unity, an idea which should always be paramount on this

day. Her power is dependent on her consciousness and her will, and increases as they develop. Herein is the connection with what I said last year.

We are not called upon to demonstrate the existence of Humanity, we may assume it, for it is really not contested. We need not demonstrate her power. We may assume it to be the highest with which we are, as a race, in relation. The burden of proof rests on those who assert the existence of an external higher power, controlling the destinies of mankind. We cannot trace the intervention of such a higher power; we can proceed without it. What we can observe is this: the action of man, with the aim of shaping his destinies for himself; his labour, spiritual and material, exerted throughout the ages, unrecorded or recorded. All around us are visible proofs of what this exclusively human power has been, the evidences of its continuity and even of its increase. These material witnesses are open to the inspection of all; the works of man, his tilth, his constructions, his inventions; we see them and are even too proud of them. We have the records of similar effects which the course of time has borne away. We have also the results in large abundance of man's spiritual labour. But in all equally we can see but man. Therefore it is with us as with the astronomer. The observation of the facts enables us to account, in the one case, for the mechanism of the heavens, in the other, for our existing human order, without resorting to an hypothesis outside the sphere of observation. It is only when we enter on the unpositive question of the origin of things that we introduce a complication on which discussion is endless—a point well illustrated by what I have seen of the controversy now being carried on between two eminent fellow-countrymen, a controversy to which their position lends a passing interest.

We are not ungrateful for the super-human conceptions by which man has aided himself, nor coldly blind to their beauty. It were unfaithfulness to our traditions were we so. We only judge that their usefulness is over, and that it is better to admit our own direct responsibility. For us then the unaided power of man is adequate to account for the results we see to have been attained. No one questions this in the present; why should we question it in the past,

Material and mental, all that we see of actual achievement is avowedly within the range of human competence, and that competence is felt not to be on the wane but on the increase. Yet the achievement of to-day is the child of that which to-day has inherited; no break in the descendance is perceptible; no new faculties are evoked, though long exercise has given the faculties we have a much greater power and long combination has placed at their disposal largely augmented forces.

Convinced, then, of the power of Humanity; convinced also that she has ever been and will be her own exclusive providence, we are more concerned with the question: Can her power be increased, her providential action made more efficacious. Thus our interpretation of her past leads us to the consideration of her future.

Under either aspect of the past, there is ample reason for confidence in the future, as destined to manifest the efficacy of the human providence on a much grander scale. I say, under either aspect, for the past has two aspects, which accounts for the difference of the judgments we hear. From the one point of view it is an unbroken upward progress; a vast constructive effort in the interest of the future, which has been crowned with a large amount of success and has handed down to us and our successors the means of achieving ever new triumphs. We have but to follow those who have opened the path to us; we may be sure that our labour as theirs will be fruitful. There is no doubt here of the power vested in man.

Or take the darker side of the picture. In man's progressive movement there have been oscillations, alternations of success and failure, of organisation and disorder; there has been much waste, much to mar or thwart the greatest creations; whatever has been won, has been won at great cost. Still the more we insist on the gloomier features of our earlier state, the more do we bring out the inherent strength which such obstacles have not availed to crush; the more clear is it that their mere removal promises a brighter future, as liberating force which had been previously wasted.

In the past then, success and failure alike bear witness to the power of Humanity. What is needed is a wiser direction

of the power, for unquestionably we have inherited a very imperfect condition, owing to the absence of guidance or its imperfection. On what are we to rely for this wiser direction? The race, as the individual, learns from experience and under its teachings avoids mistakes and pursues approved methods, and its experience has now been long and most instructive. Unlike the individual the race is certain of time in which to put its experience to use. But the race, as the individual, need not any longer trust to experience alone. For the direction both need they can rely on the combination of the experience of the Past with the conception of the Future, the two co-operating in the guidance of the Present—in other words of each succeeding generation.

The joint inspiration drawn from the co-operation of these two constituents of the one indivisible Humanity is a yet untried force, if by trial we mean its conscious and general application. Partially and instinctively no doubt it has always been at work, nor would we disparage its effect as so applied. On the contrary, we would augur well from what it has done in its nascent state as to what it will be able to achieve when fully developed. As we now have it, placed in our hands as it were, it is so new and of such vast capability that we are slow to feel its full value. By degrees we shall rise to a juster estimate, but meanwhile it is in motion and working powerfully towards a profound alteration in all existing modes of thought, the forerunner of other and more palpable changes.

I can but touch lightly and by way of suggestion on this possible influence of the conception of the future on the guidance of the present, under the sobering control of the past. Anyone who has in his own personal experience undergone the change from an aimless life to one that has a fixed purpose, and felt how completely altered in his own being he emerges from that change, has the means of understanding in a degree the corresponding change for the race and may foreshadow to himself faintly its effects—as in the individual it may be said to constitute the man, so in respect to the race it constitutes Humanity. All her subsequent existence becomes purposeful, her advance is deliberate and understood; all her servants can work henceforward with a consciousness of the

aim of their work. It is one of the special privileges of their service, be it remembered, that it is of use to the Being they serve. This distinguishes our Religion from the religion at any rate of our immediate predecessors. They could obey and serve but they could not help. They must receive all—return nothing. Our service in our generation helps to perfect Humanity if rightly discharged, it augments her power. It becomes therefore of more importance in our eyes; the detail which before seemed trivial becomes of consequence. At the same time there is ample scope for humility and the other justly valued sentiments of the older religion. The superiority of the power we serve remains so great; what we can give is so little in comparison with what we receive from her; what we do, if done to the best, is so immeasurably little in relation to what has been done for us, that there is no room for an unwholesome self-glorification. And let the generations improve as they may, this restraint on undue assumption will never cease, for the disproportion is always on the increase for each successive generation. This consideration of our peculiar relation to Humanity in respect of service is not out of place here. Such service, no longer merely a matter of personal discipline, nor an element in our education for another state of being, but with an efficacy of its own, an efficacy in the present and for the future, tends not merely to improve in quality but to enlighten us as to our conduct, and through this enlightenment of the individual to bring light and vigour into the purpose of the whole.

The power of Humanity is great. But it has its limits and they must be acknowledged. Our earlier religious experience offers us the means of clearly expressing the difference in this respect between her and the power whom she succeeds. If among my hearers there are those who still accept and live by the Christian faith, they will not I trust feel that it is in any negative or hostile spirit that I use its teachings. In the most condensed, most known of Christian prayers, we find the petition: Give us this day our daily bread. It is simple and direct. We cannot use it. We have to substitute the language of thanksgiving. We, that is, as they who use the petition, recognise that

for our daily bread, the supply of the necessities of life, we depend on a power outside us; nay, that with the growth of human society our dependence increases. We do not make the change from pride but because the facts as we see them impose the alteration.

I will not enter on our conceptions of prayer. In the higher forms of prayer we are in essential agreement with our friends who remain in the older faith. But I may point out, when so much objection is taken to our system on the ground that the power we address cannot hear or answer prayer, that for the supply of daily wants we are on a level with all around us. I would ask, to whom is it that prayer is addressed practically when an answer in some tangible form is wished or expected? Is it not to a human power, not to a superhuman? Churches, missionary societies, hospitals, educational projects, charitable institutions of all kinds—all who want to realize this or that scheme of benevolence—all who are weak or suffering or destitute, the victims of pestilence or famine or storms or war, the victims equally of human agencies or of those which are commonly called the visitations of God, of what the older religionists look on as direct manifestations of the Almighty, one and all, to whom do they appeal for a remedy? It is to their fellow men, often as individuals, often as collective bodies—and as such representatives of the great collective organism. In any very remarkable disaster, for instance a conflagration in Canada, or the cholera in Spain, the first power to which men turn is the city of London, as the centre of the wealth of the race, the heart of its industrial energy.

Allowing the limitations which all allow in the power of man, we yet feel that power to be real and great. Where does it reside? In whom is it vested? The answer is, that as the consciousness of Humanity was found to reside in the generation for the time being, as her will was found to be expressed by that generation, so it is with her power. It is vested in the present, which thus assumes its due importance in the ever-lengthening chain of the ages. It has to learn from the experience of the Past, to bring the Future before it, and on the union of the two to act in the interest of that Future. To the present then, in the name

of the Past, in the interest of the Future, we must direct our effort.

We may be encouraged to that effort by many thoughts. The past has suffered much, may we not contribute to the diminution of such suffering for those who come after us? We speak of the long past, and it has been long; but it is but as a span in comparison with the time which remains for Humanity, so far as we can judge. We have in a degree which our fathers have not had, the power of prevision within certain limits. We speak of the prophets of old, and we justly admire their sublime anticipations. But their visions were the visions of the poet rather than of the prophet—the expression of feeling without any ground of reason. Whereas in the perfect unity which our conceptions introduce the whole movement of human affairs is due to the action of identical forces; there is no gap in the chain of events, so that, by a deeper study and the clearer understanding it will give, man may attain such rational prevision as may afford real guidance. He stands on surer ground than he has ever done in this respect. Nor need he, be it said, in any way renounce the more poetic form of prophecy.

Such are the reflections on the power of Humanity, its greatness and its imperfection, which I have been able to lay before you to-day. They are less complete than I could wish, but they may direct your thought to the subject, a subject difficult from its fulness, but by that very quality full of power for us. For as year after year, under one aspect or another, with more or less success, I bring before you on this occasion of her Festival, the power we all serve, immediately or otherwise, the feeling grows upon me of the inexhaustible wealth for the supply of our wants, as intellectual and moral beings, which her nature and her life have in them. From one personal existence, exalted by the concurrent labours of many Christian generations, the really religious believers in that person among our fathers and contemporaries have drawn and draw ever renewed matter for their thought, inspiration for their better life. We have put before us with the same object not one person, but the sum of all the noble existences which have preceded us, and we have revealed to us the one collective being in which they all co-exist. We have but to

apply the well tried method of earlier generations to the **richer** materials we possess. We can drink deep of the **inspiring** influence of individual example—we can **contemplate** the rise, we can meditate on the maturity of the **Collective Being**—we can see her in her humble origin, we **can** trace her in the majesty of her power. No one spring **of** inspiration is closed to us, no incentive denied us which **can** be of use in raising us to the level of the great demand **our** duty makes upon us. The generation which shall fall **below** its duty cannot plead any inadequacy in the means for **its** accomplishment.

‘O Virgin Mother, daughter of thy Son!’ &c.

DANTE : *Par.* xxxiii., 1-22. See p. 519.

THE ANNUAL ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE

CHURCH OF HUMANITY, 19 Chapel Street, Lamb’s Conduit Street, W.C.

on the Festival of Humanity 98 (1 January, 1886),

CONFIDENCE IN HUMANITY.*

I shall speak but shortly of ourselves and our movement here. Our aim remains the same. We seek to inaugurate a quiet, gradual reconstruction of social order under the inspiration of a religion in its complete idea—worship, doctrine, life, a life of discipline. We would therefore establish the germ of a new church, a church Catholic in a truer sense than was its mediæval predecessor, a church which shall be strictly human. This new church accepts the task to which the old has been found unequal; it has to act on all the discordant elements around it, and bring them one after another into accord. Our efforts must be proportioned to our weakness, they are necessarily on a small scale as yet; everything depends on their being in the right direction. Their results are no doubt in glaring contrast with our avowed purpose; but we must take into account the period of our existence as well as our general circumstances, together with the strength of the opposition both from within and from without.

If at times we feel the contrast too great, we may find comfort in recurring to older days and to the beginnings of that which in the West we see still existing—the Christian Church in all its branches. That which, even in its decay seems so strong, was once, as we now are, in the feebleness of its beginnings, with an apparently hopeless labour before it. It overcame its weakness and triumphed over all opposition, for it was wanted. Using its example and its inheritance, we shall overcome, for we are wanted, to supply its deficiencies—to complete its work.

Our method remains the same. In the face of all difficulties, we proceed on the course on which we set out.

* The commemorative form given on pp. 225, 226, applies also to this address.

Whatever changes experience or new wants may suggest, we shall be ready to make; but to our principle we adhere. Entrusted with a new religion, we present it in a religious form. Imperfect that form must be; we are well aware of that. Time will remedy imperfection, the principle stands good. Much may be done by ourselves if we estimate aright the agencies that are at this early stage available. It is our wisdom, it is our duty, to use them to the uttermost—ever ready to create new ones as occasion arises. That many of us do not see this duty is clear, and to their not seeing it is mainly due the slowness of our growth. For our concert is thereby lessened, and the force of our action on others is also lessened; whilst our own work, all we do, is the worse for it. Our influence on the world without must bear some proportion to our own internal advance. I am not given to attach much value to the criticism bestowed upon us, nor indeed to criticism of any kind. It need not distract our attention, be it favourable or adverse. But the impression we produce, apart from all criticisms, written or spoken, is of importance. Our lukewarmness is, so considered, a real obstacle. It has various sources,—imperfect convictions and sentiments—the non-formation of good habits—in a sense an over-confidence in the strength of the cause—a greater or less acceptance of the theory that we may abstain from action, which is troublesome, because the laws of social existence will work themselves out independently of us,—these are some of the more respectable sources of the evils from which we suffer. Possibly they may all be resolved into one: our inadequate sense of the grandeur of the cause we have adopted. The primary impulse is weak. I incline to think that there are many outside us who have a truer estimate of this grandeur, and of the latent power of the cause, than most of us here have. Such must watch with astonishment its professed disciples.

This is the greater danger to us from the pressure of other claims at a time like the present. We see—all see—numerous, numberless evils around us; we hear urgent appeals to remedy this or that social imperfection; and we lose sight of the main issue. In its highest degree this is seen most clearly in reference to what is known as Socialism, which diverts some altogether from us. But in a lesser

degree, and without diverting others entirely, it acts prejudicially upon our advance by the distraction of our energies. Were we fully persuaded of the supreme importance of the work of propagating our Religion, all minor causes, all partial efforts would take their due place as entirely subordinate. We shall suffer from this cause for a long time, for there is great impatience abroad; and with insufficient attention to the conditions of a religious change, which depends so greatly on the power it exerts on its advocates, men will hurry into external action when the main direction of their efforts should be on themselves and on their joint work as a society. The inner union and strength of that society are what we should look to first—whereas it often seems to me as if any such consideration stood about third with us. In time my hearers will come to see and feel this. Meanwhile we must watch with the greatest patience the loss of power which attends on the course at present pursued, seeking only by quiet insistence on the point to awaken thought upon it, and here and there, perhaps, to lead to a more just sense of the inexpediency of our actual conduct.

Again, our action in obedience to our method remains the same, and it is as continuous as we can make it. The usual Sunday services; the usual annual festivals, the germs of the public worship of the future; some special commemorations, those of Joan Darc and Frederic II.; the administration of the social sacraments when required; our social meetings and the meetings of the Positivist Society; in all there has been no interruption. Three of the children of Humanity have taken the sacrament of Initiation: for one that of Presentation was completed. Two of the three initiated were, by their reception of this sacrament, carrying out the engagement contracted for them in the earlier rite, thus enhancing by the evidence of persistence the intrinsic interest attaching to their act. I will only mention further the additions to our memorial tablets, to our commemorative record of our own dead, who most sensibly link us to the greater Past through our own Past. One of these tablets reminds us of an Eastern co-religionist, an aged Brahmin who remained faithful till death. The second recalls the memory of one closely connected with our earliest work in

this room, one whose loss yet weighs heavily on us, whilst her influence remains strong, an unseen but most real power. Her monument must touch all who knew her; it appeals to all equally by its form—a glance at it will show my meaning—it appeals to our deepest feelings. The social significance of these memorials is great. They speak to the living with what should be an irresistible force, intensifying all the other forces our walls represent. Other tablets are wanting to complete our record; they will come shortly. The earliest companions of our efforts must not be forgotten.

The associations of this room are very sacred to many of us. Memories of the living and the dead sanctify this the first Church of Humanity. Yet we should be looking forward. We ought to get a building of our own; a permanent seat for our religious action, with more capabilities also for the social efforts which should spring from it than we have here. The first step would be to form a fund for the securing of a site—a fund quite distinct from the Sacerdotal fund. That is formed by the general contributions. The new fund ought to depend mainly on the contributors who are in or near London; not, of course, that we should refuse help if tendered by others or those who have no other similar undertaking in their own place to forward. I suggest this for your consideration. It involves additional sacrifice, and there are many on whom I would not on any account urge additional sacrifice. For life is to many, possibly to most, under hard conditions which, by no word of mine, would I make harder. Each must judge for himself. Individual responsibility is what our system relies on; it ought to call forth our strength, it looks to the self-originating decision as to what our effort shall be. Some amount of sacrifice is good for all—this is generally recognised; and we all make some sacrifice—this I cheerfully admit. Let us ask ourselves whether it might not be a wholesome stimulus if we made more, but ask it with the greatest deliberation.

We have had with us during the year Positivists from other countries—some we have still—from Chili, Sweden, Scotland, and Ireland. The mention of such social contacts carries our thoughts naturally to all our brethren in the common faith with whom we cannot have personal inter-

course and for whom our sympathy is assured, whether they meet this day in larger or smaller numbers, or whether they stand alone in their place. There is always a special interest attaching to those who in loneliness, often in great difficulties, are with us in spirit—none more so. What many of us value so little, the opportunities of meeting fellow believers, to them would be most precious. You will run over them all in your minds, in whatever country they are found, and the range is wide. I mention in particular the gatherings in Calcutta and Brazil, from which last I consider Chile inseparable, for these two names show how wide the range is. And I do not dwell on this merely as a satisfactory indication of the extent of the acceptance of our religion. It has its importance from another side. It invites us to great prudence in the way in which we present that religion, so that it may be as widely acceptable as possible. Our vision should enlarge to meet the great variety of circumstances under which it gains adherents. The existence of Eastern members of our Church emphasizes this variety. Their antecedents are so different from the Western. No such considerations can be neglected during the period of transition. It will be different when we have passed into the normal state. Meanwhile, it is encouraging to think that our extension compels us even now to expand our vision so that it take in such diverse civilisations.

I shall offer no estimate in detail of our progress. My circular will do this in a measure. That we advance I doubt not. But I still think that probably for some time the indirect influence of the nascent church will be the greater. That its direct influence is difficult to trace, but that it exists is hardly denied. By many observers, and observers often in honourable difference from us, it is openly allowed. As to the opposition from without, we may be sure that the power of such opposition, so far as it is organised, is on the decrease. Surveying the religions of the world on a large scale, this is certain. In our own country there are many appearances which point the other way. Both in England, and elsewhere in Europe there is within certain social limits a return to the mediæval faith, traceable, partly to social reasons, mainly to increase of religious feeling which sees nothing to satisfy it but the

theological organisation of the past; so it accepts the existing in default of something better. Yet whilst we allow this, on the whole even here in England, where the movement of recoil is perhaps strongest, the organised power against us grows weaker. Nothing can compensate the Christian churches in their aggregate for the weakened hold they have upon the general masses of their countrymen. There is much to regret in this admitted fact—I say admitted, for the current expression, *the lapsed masses*, admits it—but it remains a fact. Great efforts are being made—often most honourable efforts—to stem the decay of theologism. But the tide is too strong. It bears away the resisting forces by a scarcely perceptible but yet continuous and, as continuous, most effective impulsion. I add, that opposition from without, whether in writing or act, we have only to live down. If we are right we shall surmount it; if we are wrong we shall fail. We need not discuss the matter, but let experience decide—by that alone can we be justified or condemned. A religion is judged by itself. For the opposition from within, my judgment of last year's Festival has been sanctioned by our subsequent experience. There is a perceptible tendency towards the setting aside of differences. I have done what I can in aid.

It has ever been our practice on these occasions to touch on the larger interests of contemporary Humanity, the social and political questions of the day, and I adhere to the practice now, though I have changed the order. It is, as I look on our work, most undesirable that any Positivist body should stand aloof from such interests which affect us as citizens and as men. We must handle them with all the calmness which a religious standpoint prescribes, but we must handle them. We set before us the direction of this world as our avowed object. We cannot ignore such direction in our own day. We must offer so much as we can. The doctrine committed to us enables us to offer a good deal. We are, by our Protestant antecedents, no less than by the general attitude of the religious world, Catholic and Protestant equally, inclined to shrink from these larger considerations, which we half-consciously look on as alien to religion. They are not so to our religion. It is one more instance of the personal

overpowering the social. There would be a peculiar risk attached to this error if we fell into it, the risk, viz., of giving a theologic tendency to our teaching, by virtue of the close connection of theology with our personality. But we have the less reason to fall into the error, because an examination of the above-mentioned interests, an examination conducted in agreement with our doctrine, leads us straight to the conclusion that the issue of all the complex and tangled mass of difficulties is one of no immediate attainment, but is dependent on a slow penetrating and thorough change—moral and religious change. So that from the social no less than from the personal side, we are thrown back upon or led up to the moral.

All points to the continuance of the trouble in the political world in which we have so long been living. It is just at present more recognised than it has been in past years, but during those years, on each recurrence of this Festival, I can remember no exception to the general statement, that the sense of imminent disturbance was uppermost. Now, in one form, now in another, the disquiet of the world has been constant, the sense of insecurity paramount. Necessarily as all particular disturbances are but occasions—mere symptoms of the persistent state of revolution which underlies all other causes. Still, on each return of our Festival, the form of the evil varies, and the peculiar difficulty justifies a peculiar treatment; or to put the matter differently, on each occasion a different aspect of the one essential evil may be chosen for treatment.

At any rate few at the present time consider the outlook in Europe as other than gloomy, whatever the assurance given. There is a general expectation of war in Western and in Eastern Europe. It is possible that in both a collision may be averted for a time, but the irritation remains; there is the discord which is the parent of war. If peace be maintained, it is an armed not a true peace. For the hostile feeling does not depend on this or that special cause or quarrel, but on the whole character of the relations which exist between the several larger aggregates which now compose the comity of nations—the co-existent Humanity with which we are actually concerned. We have the older

political disunion ; there is the long-standing industrial rivalry ; and the two fuse in the comparatively new source of conflict opened by the aggressive intrusion of all the leading constituents of Western Europe on the communities outside them in Asia and Africa. Hence there is no so insignificant island in Polynesia which may not at any moment embroil the whole Western world, thus endangering peace from the most unexpected quarter. The acknowledged evil has this good in it : that it shows the close connection which exists between all the portions of mankind, and between all the parts of the Earth's surface. Under a repulsive form it illustrates the first great principle for which we have ever contended : the Unity of the Race. As again, the common participation in the assertion of their immoral claims by the European nations illustrates under an equally repulsive form the second great principle : the Leadership of the West. We may observe that in almost all cases it is the term Protectorate which veils the unseemly reality of oppression. This milder language, however, has its use—it acts as a corrective, especially when several powers are in presence. We may hope then that what there is objectionable may be amended, and that in the meantime, through evil and good, through right and wrong, the essential ideas, which should be our guide in the disorder, are writing themselves indelibly on the general consciousness. To keep a temperate unexaggerative judgment in the midst of such anxieties is incumbent on us as Positivists, and therefore it is that I mention what small compensations there are in the deplorable prospect before us.

In the sphere then of human relations to which our great Master urged us to attend as the one in which the weight of the new spiritual Power should first be felt, in that sphere disorder reigns. East and West are at variance. The nations of the West are at variance. And these last are, moreover, disturbed from within, affected by the democratic socialism which is urgently crying for vast social changes. Again, in the narrower limits of each national existence the same statement is true ; in our own, as we well know, not least. The scene shifts with us so rapidly that it is hard to keep on a level with its changes ; but under all changes there is much which does not change, and whilst the power to meet our

difficulties becomes more doubtful by reason of the political instability, the difficulties themselves persist, nay increase. But to-day I content myself with this remark, and touch on none of the special questions which are agitating Europe, any more than on those which disturb the peace of the separate states of Europe or of our own country. There is no reason to alter in principle the judgments that have been given on the last-mentioned, such as Burmah and Ireland.

It is rather with reference to the general condition of Western Europe, to the mutual relations of the states constituting the European state-system, and most of all to the absence of any real unity of feeling between powers which, with all their differences, have so much in common, that I would offer a few remarks—remarks bearing on the origin of the condition we admit exists. In very broad outline I would give my conception of this origin, by an historical explanation on the most extended scale.

The dissolution of the Roman Empire of the West, due to internal more than to external causes, led, as a direct result, to the establishment of the mediæval church, as a spiritual direction of the nations in lieu of their former temporal incorporation in one great state. In a word, the Church of Rome gradually came to occupy the imperial position which had been the attribute of the Roman State. That Church after a time proved, as its predecessor, unequal to its claim; it became unable to maintain its supremacy. The direction which it had unquestionably given, and which it still claimed to give, was found inadequate, and the consequence was a dissolution of the second Empire of the West—the spiritual Empire—a dissolution again due to internal more than to external causes. This new breaking up of a constituted order was an event of wider, deeper-reaching consequences than the former, though by its nature it excited less attention. It evaded scrutiny more easily, it was therefore not so correctly judged. Its first true and consistent judgment was given in the *Philosophie Positive*. With one only of its consequences am I now concerned, the constitution of the great centralised states which mark the second period of modern European history; the formation of the various imperial kingdoms which in substance all equally disclaimed

any higher authority than their own, were it temporal or spiritual, were it the Holy Roman Empire or the Holy Roman Church. This lurks in the word *Imperial*. Vivid state personalities, conscious of their strength, with no law but their own interest in most cases, though hardly with such cynical nakedness of avowal as at present, with no aspiration for the common welfare, under the influence of inherited aspirations, and impelled by instinctive wants as well as traditional claims, they were soon engaged in struggles with one another for supremacy. Any decided superiority of one over the other was proved impossible by these struggles, and they were thrown back on themselves and on their aggrandisement through fostering of their own internal strength. Yet even now their reduced pretensions preserve much of the old form, are entirely emanations of the old spirit. Hence the extreme mutual jealousy which prevails, the absolute international anarchy which characterises our time. Yet underneath these evils, and greatly as they predominate, we need not hesitate to see something of a wholesome movement, wholesome provisionally at any rate. As in private life a society is valuable in proportion as each member is trained to the highest point, a truth which is represented rather unpleasantly by the confused and confusing educational discussions of the day; so in regard to the Western States the society which they are destined to form will in the end be valuable in proportion as each member is more perfect, with its powers most completely called out. There is doubtless a better and a shorter road to this result than the cumbersome militarism which afflicts us, but Humanity clears herself slowly of long-established tendencies, and whilst we promote in every way a better system, we shall do well here again to recognise what there is of good in that which exists.

As a fact, then, we are in presence of international anarchy—so deeply rooted that the strongest promoters of it pass for the greatest statesmen—and as usual the fact finds doctrines ready to its hand to sanction it—to sanction it even on its worst, because its most aggressive and oppressive, side—the doctrines of individualism and survival of the fittest. Whatever value there may be in these doctrines—a point

which I discuss not here—in their applications to the conduct of nations, situated as the nations of Western Europe are situated, they are fraught with most objectionable consequences. Each of these nations may claim, and with equal reason, to be the strongest, or at any rate the fittest to survive, the chosen seed from which a new and better order is to spring—and the clash of their respective claims may lead to almost interminable war, with an amount of wasteful suffering beyond human calculation. I need not insist now on the brutal sacrifice of the belated populations which these doctrines sanction.

There is no preventive statesmanship—none at least which is visibly efficient. Where then is the staying power?—the hand which shall arrest the plague? The Papacy is not strong enough—nor, however relatively wise and moderate, is it wise enough. It has considerable power, no doubt—I often wish it had more, and that it would gather new vigour by a purely moral action awakening the consciousness of the nations of Europe. It might still greatly serve, perhaps it will, but its service cannot meet the extent of the evil. For its intellectual foundations are unable to bear any solid superstructure. It cannot satisfy the mental wants of Europe—it can therefore never recover its lost direction.

Yet the Papacy is the sole spiritual organisation of any strength. So much we may say without any unfair depreciation of other efforts made with the best motives, such I mean as the effort to establish international arbitration. There are other forces it is true, to which we may look with some confidence to mitigate the disastrous effects of the prevailing dispositions—but they are unorganised and so, uncertain—and they are the more uncertain as they are often conflicting. One such force is public opinion—a very real power, but impaired by the defects just pointed out.

The result is that there is no control—that what is called Christendom is, in its heart and centre, given over to the sway of mere material forces, or at any rate to their undue predominance—to the clash of conflicting interests. The community of theological belief which still superficially prevails has no guidance in it. It leads us nowhere in practice. It even exerts a pernicious influence in so far as it

enables men to defy more real sanctions by shrouding themselves in a purely personal covert where none can follow them. The most important social decisions are thus taken from the bar of our social judgment, and referred to a power which is but the echo of a man's personality. True, they cannot be really entirely withdrawn from their proper human tribunal, but for the time the powerful of the earth can console themselves by a partial withdrawal which is in accordance with the language of men. They can make it up with their God, to use the phrase of one of the most prominent statesmen. Such control is evidently of entirely private interpretation—sets at nought all social morality.

The evil then is clear. It is the absence of any controlling power. More definitely still, it is the non-recognition of some natural real superior to the isolated State, it is the non-recognition of Humanity as the Power in which the several States find their rule and their unity, the Power which is the legitimate claimant of their service, the source and the object of their existence and their action. This non-recognition of Humanity is in familiar words the departure from fact, the closing the eye to reality. In this defect, at the stage of human thought which we have reached, lies the explanation of the trouble which oppresses the world, for this defect constitutes the *anarchy* which is the characteristic of the later and more revolutionary centuries of European history, the Modern anarchy to which we are so continually referred in the writings of Auguste Comte.

It is but a varying of what I have said if I describe the evil as consisting in the absence of any spiritual direction. There has been none worthy of the name since the break-up of the spiritual Empire of Rome, of the Mediæval church, without there being any substitute forthcoming as yet to fill the void left. But the varied form at once points to the remedy, viz., the providing the substitute in a new and competent spiritual direction, which shall be the organ of the Human as the Papacy was of the Roman church,—which shall lead men everywhere to the recognition of the one supreme power which has a real cogency in it. For herein lies, it must be constantly repeated, the sole remedy

answering to the disorder. It is provided and its action has already begun, though the process of application may be, will be long. The generations are sacrificed pending its general acceptance.

I have spoken of the slight importance to be attached to criticism of us and of our system. Such criticism is in general marked by a total failure to grasp the ideas it discusses, as is evidenced by its almost invariably proceeding from the personal point of view—so far as I know it. But I use for my own purposes one observation I have seen. We are told that we have lost the spring of hope, and that hence we are and must be feeble. I do not know that this means more than that its authors are not strong enough themselves to dispense with certain incentives, and therefore consider that others are of the same moral calibre. They can be no authority as to our feelings—they can only argue from their own. The true answer—the answer which is of avail—is not to be put into words. It is by our persistence that we disprove the assumption made, an assumption which is not warranted by the history of Positivism, will not be warranted, I am confident. But the particular observation is of interest as raising a practical point in connection with our confident proclamation of Humanity.

Those who so confidently proclaim Her in the face of all that we see about us, would appear at first sight, at any rate, not deficient in hopefulness: they certainly are not living in despair. But the question is, what are the grounds on which they rely for the brightening hope which, as they penetrate deeper into their faith, becomes their privilege? One ground is in our interpretation of, and our reliance on, our assistance upon, the Past. As we move reverently among its ruins, we gather up its lessons, combine its traditions, and receive that ever-deepening impression of its accomplished work, we gain from all the conviction that the same power which, unaided and undirected, save by its own instinctive action, has done so much, cannot fail, as it proceeds henceforth under a systematic direction, and is guided by the lessons of its past experience, to justify our confidence that it will do still more. Veiled under other names Humanity has risen to Her present height: in Her own name She will

surely not see her power diminished. Our commemoration of the Past, and our communion with it, both conspire to one result—to a rational and justified hope. We rely on a proved strength.

But Hope is an onward looking force, and the future is its proper sphere. Does the future of Humanity repel our hopefulness? or are we unhopeful in regard to it? It may well be that in the darkness and sadness of the hour, surrounded as we are by waste and suffering, with a burden of losses from our Past, with the experience of errors and misdirection, a certain depression comes on us at times, its amount varying with our temperament, as it has ever done under the Christian system. But with due allowance for this natural feeling, I take it that none are more really, more steadily hopeful than the disciples of our Religion. The teachings of our Master enable us to see beyond the immediate, whilst they enable us also to understand it. They calm excitement, whilst they awaken enthusiasm. I speak of their effect when they work at their best. They discourage an over-sanguineness, but they foster a rational hope. Think at once of the intellectual insight into the surrounding phenomena attested by, and the moral support which may be educed from, the judgment in which he sums up the whole of human progress, the proposition that Man becomes more and more religious. Yet no one saw so clearly the anarchy, the irreligion, the undutifulness, of his own revolutionary time. Only he suffered it not to dim the conception which linked the generations to one another.

All things considered, then, the Future agrees with the Past in warranting a rational hope. I do not forget that it is a hope for the race, not in the ordinary sense for ourselves. But I cannot bring myself to dwell on the question of the personal hope in the ordinary sense. I am glad to see it dwelt on by others, for it is my belief that we are outgrowing it, and that, as each successive advocate urges it with earnestness and eloquence, it comes more strongly into contrast with the stronger, nobler doctrine which we teach, and is weakened by the comparison. I believe it to be not only baseless, but morally disastrous. I am pleased to note Mr. Francis Newman's agreement so far.

But the point of our hopefulness is completely secondary to the consideration of the power of Humanity which it served to introduce. To that I return.

Communion with the Future by the right use of our imagination working in harmony with reality through a sound understanding of our Present, would amply suffice to keep alive hopefulness. The comparison of the two would make it clear to what are due the worst features of the actual state of things and how they may be in another time avoided. It would do more even. It would guide us even now to partial remedies—to palliatives—to the truer conceptions, the default of which is the source of so much that is amiss—to the avoidance, consequently, of false remedies. If moral evil is accountable for the larger portion of the suffering of life, there is still a large amount derived from mental error. We are, as each succeeding generation is, under the sway of certain impressions, accepted conventions which we do not question. Carry forward our thought, look at what we accept with the eyes of our descendants, and what we have unquestioningly admitted may become most debateable. And as we, within our own experience, have learned to regard as untenable much to which we once assented, so we may be sure that our successors will examine and reject much of that which is now admitted and to which we attribute such evil results.

In proportion as we live in the true spirit of our Religion with the coming time ever in our ken, we shall be familiar with the influence of our doctrines on the thoughts and conduct of our descendants. Further, this communion with the Future will be seen to fuse the two ages with which we are most closely concerned, as they are the two on which we can act—might we not say, of both alike, *in* which we can act. It is in the interest of our successors that we work at present; our work, so far as it is good, tells directly on their welfare, lives on amongst them.

I take as an illustration of what I have been saying two statements with which we are familiar, which are in strong opposition with current practice, but which we can see are making gradual way. Accepted at first, and cordially, by the best of our opponents who see in them, and with partial

justice, but a re-proclamation of truths of their own which had lain rather dormant, they are penetrating, without reference to either source, the general mind. The statements I mean are that Politics are to be subordinated to Morals, Rights to Duties. The truest, strongest form of the latter is that we have no rights, only duties. The two are, it is plain, in the very closest connection. Confront these two principles with the state of Europe as before depicted. They are the highest thoughts of the present, and the practice of the present recoils from them with aversion. Conceive them, you will be justified if you so conceive them, as the accepted principles—the average thought of our more or less immediate successors, and the whole scene changes. The axe is laid to the root of the evil. The self-assertion of each separate nationality would be in direct contradiction with the convictions of mankind, and allowing, as all allow, that ideas govern in the long run, each state must soon recognise its duty of submission to the welfare of the whole.

We may learn from our own social experience at once the necessity and the advantage of introducing these maxims as between nations. They may penetrate Society—I use the word in its every day sense—but superficially, but without them it would not be tolerable. To waive our own rights, to concede the just claims of others, to be forward in attending to their wants rather than in dwelling on our own; these are of the essence of family and social life. As we advance in our fitness for its highest forms all self-assertion tends to disappear, at first doubtless only outwardly, but the outward acts gradually on the inward. In the intercourse of nations it would be everything to secure some approximate outward adoption of these principles, for the intercourse of nations remains superficial, does not penetrate into the inner life, so far, that is, as it is, in the proper sense, the intercourse of nations.

The thoughts suggested by the troubled state of the world, and more particularly by the anarchy of Western Europe, have led me to the grounds of our hope in regard to it, and ultimately to certain moral considerations in which the larger as well as the more restricted social morality finds a point of contact with the more distinctly personal, the

interaction of states being rested on the same ground as the intercourse of individuals. In the same course of thought I have had to consider the two greatest constituents of Humanity as a permanent and continuous being, and their joint influence on the actual generation, that Present which is the depository of Her consciousness, Her will and Her power. In the absolute unity of purpose which pervades all the three constituents, when rightly viewed, we may read an equally absolute certainty of the ultimate accomplishment of the purpose.

The purpose of which I am now speaking is the establishment of the supremacy of Humanity over all personalities—national no less than individual—more directly in fact over the national than over the individual, but completely over both. There is no hope for mankind but in some external control of her successive agents, of the generations as they follow one another. There is no other control possible but that of Humanity; all others have been found wanting, either as partial, or as too weak to justify their claim to universality.

In this conclusion we here find no difficulty. It is otherwise when we come to follow it out into its consequences and construct our scheme of life and its duties upon it. Suffice it for the moment that it is possible and comparatively easy to arrive at our duties under the guidance of this leading conception, and that we can see that in their discharge is our strength. I would rather pass to a moral change, which our free and convinced acceptance of the sway of Humanity implies, as a result of the social character thereby stamped on man's whole existence. It is the instinct that some such change must follow on its adoption which works with many to the rejection of the new Religion. Not that they find the old religion more to their taste in this respect, but they have either arranged that to suit their objects or they have abandoned it, and the arising of a new one which they find hard to shirk is distasteful.

In what direction will the whole existence of man be changed under the new influence? If I were driven to choose one expression in which I should sum up the conception which I think will prevail and colour our whole scheme of life, my choice would be in the words of the *Imitation*, *as*

nesciri—Love to be unknown. In Book I., ch., 2, there stands the verse '*If thou wouldst know and learn something to the purpose, love to be unknown and to be esteemed as nothing.*' Love to be unknown! The words do not pass the just limits of an ideal presentation of the truth. In this direction, I must think, logically tends the strictly human Ideal when cleared of every the smallest remnant of theological belief, leaving, as has been said by a theologian, to the thought of the future not the most etherealised conception of an external Power as interfering in, or consciously acting upon, human affairs. That in the West we are, on the surface at least, not tending in this direction I quite allow. Far from it. What the supreme power in a State encourages, that prevails throughout; and our noisy competitive parliamentary life encourages the opposite spirit to that to which I point. But in this, as in so many other instances, we may wisely distrust the surface current and watch for the real stream which has a different bearing. The logic of human progress is an irresistible force. Our movement will, then, depend on the nature of the Power which holds sway over mankind. It is a humble Power which we accept and help to constitute, nay, in part create; and its disciples may well learn humility from the object of their service and adoration. It is in the extremest significance of the term a social Power, and its disciples may well cultivate in themselves all that ministers to the perfection of social life. It is a peaceful Power by its very idea; it has no associations with strife beyond the upward struggle with an apparently untoward but beneficial destiny; it is in no sense the Lord of Hosts, and its disciples may well turn from all the more stirring associations of war, and, limiting war to its most inevitable necessity in the present, labour for its complete extinction. These attributes, and they are enough for my purpose, point the same way, to the disuse of much which has been and is characteristic of our conceptions of life and conduct, to the introduction as the ruling thought of a new ideal. Our present ideal, if I may concentrate what I have in my mind in one word, is distinction—national and personal distinction—the somewhat neutral term is all the more useful. To succeed in the battle of life, to rise in the world, to push

ourselves forward, to make our mark, to secure a sphere for our energies—these and similar phrases represent the desire to be distinguished, to stand above and aloof from others; and the desire in both cases is accepted as unquestionably legitimate, and it is therefore fostered not disciplined, much less discouraged.

The lines in which Wordsworth speaks of Milton:—

Thy soul was as a star and dwelt apart,
Thou hadst a voice whose sound was like the sea;
Pure as the naked heavens, majestic, free,
So didst thou travel on life's common way,
In cheerful godliness; and yet thy heart
The lowliest duties on herself did lay.

may seem at first sight to conflict with my idea, but it is not so in reality. Well examined, they represent my meaning. For there is in my meaning no thought of suppression of personal differences. The lines recognise, it is true, the inherent distinction of a surpassingly noble nature, made nobler by art, by discipline; but such natures have one conclusive test: they would ever, in the broadest human spirit, to use the language of a recent statesman—level upwards—place others where they stand themselves. Milton will stand this test. No, in the future as in the past the different natures of men will make themselves felt, and the greater will be in their greatness, as they have ever been, apart. But they will not rest on their apartness as a privilege; much less will they seek it or nurse themselves in their isolation from pride. Their travel will be along life's common way; their hearts will lay on the lowliest duties. These latter traits are the characteristic traits of the human Future when wisely organised. Purer, more majestic, freer, should be the souls of all; but more lowly in their purity, majesty, and freedom; more keeping to the common way, more bent on the lowliest duties. Such, I believe, has ever been the aspiration of all the higher spirits throughout all time. It will be the task of the Future consciously to translate the aspiration of the few into the average attainment of the many. It is a higher, more saintly—I have no shrinking from the word—a character that will be evolved. It is thought that it will be less favourable to heroism. Not so, I believe. It is with in

the lowliest sphere of life that the lifeboat service of our coasts is discharged. I see no deficiency of heroism in respect of it. It may be asked, How far is to be carried this complete adjustment of man's existence to a quieter order, an order which shall be alien to the hurry and excitement and restless competition and ambitious self-forwarding of our present life? The answer is, that practically there is no limit—our whole being must be moulded into this moral change with a truly social object. It is for us and our descendants the *new man* which we must put on, under the gradual working of the true conception of Humanity.

Once more I would condense my meaning in a word. In the life of a renovated race, in the kingdom of Humanity, affection will reign supreme, as the norm and aim of our whole conduct—success will not be in power or wealth, but in noble action or wise teaching—to use the words of a sympathiser—under the inspiration of affection.

And this condensation may lead us on; we may see that by a different road we may reach the same conclusion. The inorganic Theism, to which many still attach so much value, adopts, from the organised Christianity which it rejects, one particular phrase, and finds a satisfaction in the associations which cling around that phrase. *Our Father* suggests to the Theist the image of a beneficent power outside man under whom all the discordant elements of mankind may unite in an all-embracing brotherhood. The Positive substitution of the Mother for the Father, the womanly presentation of our supreme power, symbolises the whole of the great change of which I have been speaking. Under the presidency of a motherly ideal all the images of our social life become at once images of quiet, of peace, of self-sacrifice, of devotion to others, of the discharge in fact of each most simple, lowly, human function in the spirit which invests them all with the highest beauty and nobleness. The whole result is the consecration of the common way, the way in which all can walk—its consecration and ennoblement. And this without any diminution of activity. It is no life of inertia that the future will develop. 'Love watches, and sleeping slumbers not; weary, is not tired; straightened, is not constrained; frightened, is not disturbed; but like a

living flame and a burning torch it bursts forth upwards and safely overpasses all.'

This Positive substitution of *Our Mother* for *Our Father*, with all its far-reaching consequences—consequences to be drawn out more and more fully by the increasing experience of the race, is not a sudden creation with no roots in the past. We have been growing towards it through the long centuries of man's religious history. In its complete maturity it rests on well-examined foundations. Man's moral constitution, his social existence, the relations of the sexes, their different functions and spheres of action, the confirmation of all conclusions drawn herefrom by the interpretation of man's social evolution, finally the warrant of earlier anticipations combined with a just sense of the needs of our spiritual life, these may suffice for our present consideration. What I more particularly dwell on is this: that it is from a purely human source, on a purely human foundation, by in every sense purely human means, that we reach the idealisation of the Mother as the true representative of Humanity, the idealisation of Humanity as *Our Mother*, the supreme condensation which gives a concrete character to our worship. All is in unison therefore with regard to her, we have no chasm to overpass, no effort to make to link the human to the divine, the effort which has been so painful and has so completely failed. This purity of her human origin is a great strength for Humanity. It so completely assimilates Her to her servants who adore Her, the bond between them is indissoluble from every point of view. It is therefore, as Aristotle saw, by some straining of the term that we apply the term divine to Man as to men, to Humanity as to her worshippers. Be this as it may, unaided from without, Humanity has controlled her own destiny, and in spite of some imperfections has at length secured her revelation and its acknowledgment. Unaided from without, by the action of powers, that is, entirely within her own range, she now is working out her own constitution, she has created her own more peculiar representative. She stands sole upon her Planet, the Virgin Mother of mediæval aspirations, the Virgin Mother of the ever-deepening reality of the religious life of the Present and the Future.

Daily with increasing force She is asserting herself. Her servants need in no wise despond. In many ways, and under many forms, men are contributing to the inauguration of her reign, Her servants with, Her opponents against, their will. The one imperious necessity was that She should be revealed, Her existence made known, disengaged from the types of which She had in all ages been the substance. This Auguste Comte has done and he has done much more. He has in all its great outlines constructed the temple into which She is to enter—the Church of Man. This once done, by her reality Humanity moves to her rightful position as the Sovereign of this her Planet, and moves rapidly. Her consciousness more drawn out, Her will gaining in definiteness, and, as a consequence of the advance in both, Her power steadily on the increase—She affords her believers ample ground for their confidence in Her. They have but to proclaim Her.

So it is ; into the stormy scene of human disorder sprung from individual and national selfishness, with its abundant misrule, with its theory of unrule, there is thrown the new faith, the new religion which commands the assent of its actual believers, and claims universal assent. There issues in short a new spiritual direction in the name of a new Power, the Power however which has been the real creator of man's past, to which we look for his future. We are familiar with, we have heard afresh of late, the songs in which the Christian world expresses its rejoicing in the advent of its Saviour. Beautiful as they are they jar sadly with the facts of historical Christianity. We are without the hymns, but we are without the jar, and we have the full equivalent. We cannot speak of the heavenly host, the herald angels, but the great of all human time usher in the Power whom we acknowledge ; the exertions, the sufferings, the creations of long generations are the groundwork of her real dominion. She descends not from on high, she rises from the Earth, her and our common mother, her and our common home. With all that constitutes her existence we are as men in the closest, the profoundest sympathy. She assumes her kingdom by virtue of her accumulated achievement, by virtue of her power to fulfil within human limits the

hitherto unfulfilled prophecies of our Western religious tradition, of her power to fulfil not only the instinctive aspirations of her unconscious but the systematic prophecies of her conscious servants.

'O Virgin Mother, daughter of thy Son!' &c.

DANTE : *Par.* xxxiii, 1-22. See p. 519

THE ANNUAL ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE
CHURCH OF HUMANITY, 19 Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C.
On the Festival of Humanity 99 (1 January, 1887).

HUMANITY AS THE VIRGIN-MOTHER.

With all centres of our faith wheresoever they exist ; with all its scattered disciples ; with the members of all other religious organisations or beliefs, Monotheist, Polytheist, or Fetichist, all lesser distinctions being absorbed in the one bond of community of religious aim ; with the whole human race ; with man, that is, wherever found and in whatever condition, again all lesser distinctions being absorbed in the one bond of our common humanity ; and with the animal races which, during the long effort of man to raise himself, have been, as they still are, his companions and helpers, we, on this occasion, on this Festival of Humanity, would be in conscious sympathy.

Nor with our contemporaries alone are we in sympathy, but even more with the larger portion of the race which constitutes the Past. We gratefully commemorate the services of all the generations whose labours we inherit and wish to hand down with increase to our successors. We acknowledge the sway of the Dead.

We gratefully commemorate also the services of our common Mother, the Earth, the Planet which is our home, and with her the orbs which form the Solar System, our World. We may not separate from this last commemoration that of the milieu in which we place that System, the Space which has ever been of great service to Man, and is destined to be of greater, by his wise use, as it becomes the recognised seat of abstraction, the seat of the higher laws which collectively constitute the Destiny of Man, and is introduced as such in all our intellectual and moral training.

From the Present and the Past we extend our sympathies to the Future, to the unborn generations which with happier lot shall follow us on this earth ; the thought of whom should

be constantly present to our minds in order to complete the conception of Humanity as revealed to man by the founder of our Religion by the full recognition of the continuity which is her noble characteristic. The memory of her greatest servant Auguste Comte, and with it the memory of his three GUARDIAN ANGELS, finds a fitting place in this, her greatest Festival, consecrated as it is by its very idea to the remembrance of all her servants, known or nameless—to the remembrance of all the results they have achieved and by which they live.

Wisest and noblest of teachers! May all of us who avow ourselves thy disciples, animated by thy example, supported by thy doctrine, guided by thy construction, face all the obstacles which indifference or hostility throws in our way, and in the midst of this revolutionary age, undebased by any hope of reward, undeterred by any ill success of our efforts, in a spirit of submissive veneration carry forward the great work to which thy life was devoted—the work of human regeneration by and through the systematic Worship of Humanity.

Our Sunday mornings and other meetings enable us to treat the special points of interest as they arise in the course of the year, and to treat them not as mere intellectual discussions, but under the control of a social and religious purpose. As a consequence, on an occasion like this, we can limit ourselves to the re-stating conclusions without the detail of discussion, where it may seem advisable to do so—choosing the subjects on which to touch with more fulness, and just indicating others.

There is no essential change in the general state of things. During the past year European peace has been kept, but we have been on the very verge of war. We appear to be so still. Extending our view as widely as possible, the relations between East and West seem to be rather less strained, and the extra-European jealousy between the Western Powers, their jealousy in regard to the belated races whose just claims they ignore, is also, temporarily at any rate, lulled. But within the boundaries of Europe itself there is evident

danger to the world's peaceful advance. Much is done to avert the danger, but the inheritance of the Past is a mixed one, and its natural fruits have to be gathered in, as there is but slight hope of a really wise change, even in the sphere of strictly political action. There may then be peace and we may hope it will continue, but profound it can hardly be. The statesman who used the expression has already changed his tone.

I should not be inclined to mention the trivial and passing bustle of the year in England were it not for two of its features ; first: the onesided estimate which pandered to the real or factitious enthusiasm,—the estimate I mean which dwelling on one side only of the picture kept the darker side out of sight. For we cannot forget that the reign which was made the groundwork of a kind of apotheosis has been a bloodstained reign, leaving many memories of fraud and violence, of unjust and pernicious aggrandisement. And this should have tempered the foolish outburst. Afghanistan, China, Japan, India, Abyssinia, the Gold Coast, South Africa, Egypt—what evil associations the names revive ! But all are set aside or merely hinted at, in order to leave free course to our self-glorification.

The second feature, in closest connection with the first, is the stimulus it all was meant to give to the imperial spirit, as is manifested by the permanent memorial which it is desired to raise at the cost of a great strain. It is curious to observe to what an extent this spirit found its way into the churches around us—curious to observe, in direct contradiction with the better side of their system, the inflated national tone of some of the episcopal and other utterances at the Church Congress. The Church and Empire—two ideas which are really in fundamental opposition—shake hands in defiance of the teachings of history and of all true religious intelligence. And we have the singular birth of an *imperial church*, a monstrous combination. Theology—war—empire—the alliance of the three is practically indissoluble.

Within our own Empire our efforts seem in the general at present wisely devoted to a defensive policy, on all grounds so desirable. The latest extension, the ill-judged, unprincipled seizure of what was left of Burmah is not encouraging to any

advance of our frontier. The cost of that seizure has yet to be learnt, a veil is thrown over all Burmese affairs which it is difficult to penetrate, but such particulars as escape from under the veil are not reassuring.

In Ireland all feel that the outlook is gloomy and not improving. The broad conclusions we come to here are that Ireland should be treated on the principle of looking to her interest not to the interest of England, and that all ought to work towards her constitution as a separate state, an independent, self-directed factor in the sum total of human efforts. It is for the statesmen to contrive the means to this end and we must take what they give us, an instalment it may be or a settlement—if it is left to them to decide. For it would seem under the irritation that prevails, and judging by the past, that a rough disruption is what is most likely—our political parties not having the wisdom to unite for a more satisfactory arrangement. That Ireland interferes with our own internal advance is a general complaint. I do not know that we here need join in it. An abeyance of Parliamentary government, a lull in this restless legislation, would be no such great evil. We may well acquiesce in such a lull as there is. The interval of quiet is available for a more thoughtful study of the coming changes and of the wants of our complicated social existence. We could in fact accept a longer pause than we are likely to have. There was much wisdom in a proposal made during the Civil War period and attributed to Ireton, that Parliament should sit for six months only in each two years, leaving the other eighteen months unencumbered.

I did but allude last year to Socialism and its relation to our advance. Socialism is a growing power. The revolutionary downward movement ensures its continuance, and it must continue to grow, whether with or without the epithet Christian affixed to it, so long as another more satisfactory doctrine does not take its place. Socialism renders an important service in so far as it is an assertion of the truth that the problem to be solved is social not political.

We here are all Socialists in a degree. It is the special signification of the term which we reject, preferring our own proper name—Sociocrats. This name is enough to remind

us constantly that all the forces of society, whatever their amount, are, as creations of social effort, bound to be exerted for the good of society. Whilst then we cannot adopt the remedies or the method of socialists, we are at one with them in their interest and in their general aim. The success which the truth they have will gain we shall not grudge them. They seek the immediate—they turn to action—with a certain predominance of material progress. As our remedies are more comprehensive, due at a longer date, and directed to deeper evils, we must appear to be waiting and must accept the consequences of the more passive attitude. They who believe that a moral change is, *mentally*, the indispensable condition for any real settlement,—that a religious change—the constitution and installation of a new church—is, *practically*, the one condition of such settlement, must have the nerve to be true to their belief and to work for its propagation, without turning aside to secure more immediate results. The moral change I allude to concerns both sides in the great industrial question, capitalists and workmen. It were of speedier effect, perhaps, if the capitalist class were to take it first—of surer—in fact only then sure—when the workmen take it. Its introduction depends on the growth of the new Religion, on the increase of its power as a belief, and on the formation of a recognised organ as an intermedium. In respect to both operations the prevalent impatience is not justified, however natural it may appear.

We watch, I am sure, with as keen attention as any of our fellow citizens what is going on around us, though we are often unable to attach the same value as others to this or that measure, and we are often distrustful when they are sanguine. We feel as keenly the evils of our present condition, but the remedies proposed excite misgiving as too partial. In fact the whole treatment is too partial, too insular, too English. The disease is common to all the West; it is not to be satisfactorily met by merely national remedies nor to be explained by merely local causes.

If, as I believe, the new force which the collective Positivist body represents must be as yet essentially a spiritual agency, with an indirect operation, if our function is to form opinions and convictions, to influence, not to govern, it follows that

we cannot mix in ordinary direct action, that we must stand aloof from the agitation of conflicting interests; if our voice is to be heard amidst the clamour we must give security for its impartiality.

The position we thus take is not a popular one—we must submit to be misjudged. On the whole we are more candidly and more leniently judged than we might have expected. Few have been the times in which it was more desirable that there should be found strength for such submission, strength to maintain an independent judgment. And where if not in our doctrine and comprehensive aim is to be found the source of this required strength? None can afford to wait as we can, if waiting is imposed on us—if it be accepted as an act of obedience to our principles, not adopted as an excuse for inaction.

Closely akin to and yet distinct from Socialism is the question of the unemployed—of late so prominent. What are we to say on this? I may recur to what I said when it was most urgent—that it is a concern of the government, meaning by government not merely the administration but the governing classes—the capitalist class, whether territorial or other, which is the depositary of wealth. It is not a question of private solution as to the means to be adopted for meeting an immediate difficulty. We therefore cannot undertake it, could not if we were much more numerous. It should be a passing emergency to be met by corresponding measures. But this by no means precludes private exertion. Each according to his capacity, we may lessen the sum of the distress around us by aid carefully and kindly given in cases well known to us, and given not as charity but as a token of human sympathy, on the basis that is of fellow feeling not as a duty attaching to superior riches. Strengthen the personal element and not the general charitable organisation. This collective impersonal *charity*, as it is called, has very objectionable features in it. It is tolerable only as a palliative.

Generally speaking, the direction of our effort is to moral remedies, to the removal of all violence, of all undue impatience—the established order, great as are its imperfections, is at once too valuable and too strong to be upset rapidly—to

great temperance in judgment and in the language in which we express our judgments; to the encouragement of that in which as a nation we are so deficient, mutual respect between man and man, class and class; to the simplifying and raising our own lives, agreeing therein with a movement there is in some quarters towards a higher life, so doing away with the sting of such comparative ease and enjoyment in the presence of oppressive toil and a joyless life. These, and combined with these the patient study, so far as we have leisure and competence, at once of the evils to be met—their complex sources and their history—never leaving hold of the problem, facing each new aspect as it is turned towards us—and patient study of the remedies together with the fearless statement of the results to which such study leads us—in all this there is enough to occupy our energy and to justify our refusal to concentrate what power we have on objects of more near attainment.

On both these kindred topics, Socialism and the Unemployed, we do not say *we cannot*. Quite the contrary. We can and do help; we help much more than is thought, by our doctrine, by our language on all the disputes that arise, and by our personal conduct. And for the deeper remedies there must be time given on all these subjects.

Only one further observation would I make on a point of considerable civic importance. The times are difficult, exasperation is common, as is distress. Open expression—even violent expression—will be common also, and very obnoxious to the governing classes. We can but urge on them that they put a due constraint on themselves, and not resort to measures which interfere with established modes of action—not be hasty to check—to be quite direct—meetings and other forms in which discontent finds a wholesome utterance.

The date of our meeting is suggestive. It is the first day of the 100th year of the great crisis,—the 100th year since the opening of the French States-General, since the beginning of what is specifically known as the French Revolution, when the European movement towards a new social order took in the central country a recognisable shape. The Revolution then begun is not over—far from it—we are

not as near its close as we might well be. That we are not is a fresh illustration of the slow march of Humanity; it testifies also to the depth of the convulsion. Yet a retrospect of the century is not discouraging; many evils have disappeared—much has been achieved. In the year which precedes the centenary of the French Revolution we may usefully direct our thoughts to such a retrospect. It may be to us a year of reflection, of summing up results. The corresponding year last century was a period of strong hope; men felt on the eve of great things and doubted not their power to reach them. We feel on the eve of great changes, but with less sanguineness—the previous failure of great expectations operates to depress us. The depression is not well grounded—certainly not warranted—if we calmly contrast what has been achieved with the amount of failure. When we retrace the events of the century since 1788 one lesson forces itself upon us, in agreement with the general teaching of history—that we should keep a quiet judgment on the present. The most ordinary historical observation shows the unreasonableness of attaching too much importance to transient conditions. The political changes of the century have in general been exaggerated at the time for good or for evil; only after the lapse of years has their true value been open to a correct judgment. Think of the cry of despair raised by Burke and echoed throughout Europe by those to whom it appealed; all social order was apparently to be engulfed. The 100 years have passed, and there is much left which even Burke would not object to consider worthy of the name of social order.

But we may usefully also, apart from our retrospect, apply ourselves to the judgment of the Revolution. This is not an unimportant subject for Positivists. There is, I think, a real danger that we may go wrong and suffer our historical interest and our political sympathies to overbear our soberer judgment—our judgment in conformity with our principles which are anything but revolutionary. In the centenary we might easily be carried away by the contagion of the revolutionary enthusiasm, so necessary, so noble, in its day—but which has had its day. Let us then remind ourselves that we of all men have the means given us to

place in its proper light the Revolution as an historical event—that it is in idea if not in fact at an end. The creation of the Positive religion, which this actual generation has seen, is the virtual close of the crisis which led to the Revolution and demanded it. We who believe in that Religion are therefore not of the Revolution though we are still in it. We can judge it, therefore, not be absorbed by it. We can regret the waste that has accompanied it. We can feel with it in its terrible sufferings, honour its martyrs, name with reverence its great names, value and be grateful for its large and permanent benefits. But it is of the past to us—we can range it with other similar events, place it in its due place, consider it as in the present outlasting its time, as bound to give way to the new order which has throughout been its aim. As yet that order is not come, the Religion on which it depends being still in the weakness of its origin, and all other modes of dealing with the anarchy being inadequate.

A parallel from history may be of use to us in our estimate. Carry ourselves back from the 19th to the 4th century of the common Western era, the analogous century to our own; what is the central event of that 4th century? It has other points of interest, but the true centre of attention is the installation, as the directing power in the Roman world, of the new faith—its gradual triumph over the old. Such is our present estimate, with reference to which we judge the statesmen even of the 4th century, the Emperors on whom its difficult task devolved. So it will be for our own century. It too is an outwardly eventful period, fertile in changes which seem great to us. They occupy us unduly; they are relatively insignificant, passing symptoms of a want, a void, the absence of a direction; they really constitute urgent demands for such direction. They are not the central cathedral interests of our time. We ought in the strength of our belief to be able to take our stand outside them—to treat them as mere symptoms, mere indications of the needs of man; openings at best for higher things as they manifest the decay of the past order—as they are calculated to bring into prominence the methods for entering on the new life.

Whatever the subject, extra-European or European complications—Imperialism—the Empire or its constituents

severally—Socialism and its connections—historical considerations and prevision—all equally refer us to Humanity as giving us the true vantage ground from which to look at them; placing them in their due proportion and bringing them into unity. Under her inspiration, we see them all as representing to us certain well defined duties; under her example we are led to import into them the spirit of self-renunciation which characterises her own action.

This brings me back to the considerations which I set before you last year, and from which I would now proceed. The complete supremacy of Humanity we accept, nor are we anxious to curtail in any way our acknowledgment, or to speak with hesitation and timidity of her claims. This I believe to be our prevailing feeling here. Are we equally alive to the importance of its fearless assertion? I have been of late, and I now recur to the point, dwelling on the necessity of the boldest insistence on the fact that the new Religion is the substitution of a new Power in the place of the one hitherto and still acknowledged; that it is in antagonism with its Christian predecessor—an antagonism not the less marked because it is respectful and unaggressive; that we have to move on to the new ground without any attempt at compromise—to shift our basis without any reserve. We abandon the older illusion quite certainly; we adopt the new reality with more hardiness as the years roll on. We see and we welcome the indirect approaches made towards us by our opponents. We see the gradual penetration into the metaphysical or theological camp of ideas and names which are ill-assorted to their new surroundings. We hear of Christian Positivism, whatever that may mean; of Christian Sociology—terms which testify that what was once shunned as a grotesque absurdity is seen to have in it valuable elements—a power for guidance. But such symptoms of coming changes only make it more necessary for us to be distinct in our own bearing. We are not ungrateful—we do not repudiate our debt to the past—we are what we are by our early training under Christian associations; but we have on one capital point to break with them and we cannot disguise the nature of the step we are taking.

This great step is well represented by a change of name ; it demands a change of name. It is well to give up the God Idea, but it is an ineffectual advance unless we substitute another in its place. In abandoning the Fatherhood of God we cannot dispense with the essential object of that conception, and we attain it by replacing it. We turn to the Mother, the common Mother of us all, to the Motherhood of Humanity, of which I spoke last year. It is unwisely urged that there is no importance in dwelling on a name. I would commend to the attention of those who urge this the second clause in the Lord's Prayer—Hallowed be Thy Name. That clause rests on a real, universal want of man, that of belonging openly and avowedly to some great personality, individual it has been hitherto, collective we make it. In short the whole religious experience of the race attests the importance of a name—and in the perpetual iteration of the name chosen or given lies a spring of great power. Passages in the Jewish and Christian scriptures which support this view are familiar to many of you.

Our honourable theological opponents make no such mistake. They are well aware of the importance of the name and the consequences of the substitution we effect. They would urge that we lose greatly by the change, that we rob mankind of something of great price. Where is the loss? we may ask. Sonship—the filial relation—remains untouched—I might say much more, it is raised and beautified—our common Mother loses no advantage which her vicegerents, her successive creations, offered our fathers or ourselves. For she stands nearer to us, is more intimately related to us. They were entirely her creations; she is our creation but she also creates us. She is a seen power as well as unseen; her greatest representative has been at all times confessedly unseen. He was a postulate; she is a demonstrable existence. Humanity is said to be a difficult conception. Is the conception of Spirit easier? We can more easily then realise our sonship in Humanity than we could under the common Father. Still our national tradition is against us, and we can see the advantages possessed by the nations or portions of nations which have remained Roman Catholic. The Mariolatry which offends Protestants and Positivists who come

PP

from Protestantism, is a strength to those trained in Catholicism. As we go forward this difficulty will lessen. We shall at any rate find the uses of the filial relation not impaired by the exclusive reference to the Mother: neither for son nor daughter will it be lowered in value—less even for the son than for the daughter; for it is a more wholesome corrective to the natural bias.

So again for the fraternal relation. The brotherhood in Humanity is as effectual as the brotherhood in God in its idea. In practice it could not be less so; so far, we may take comfort in our insistence upon it. It is under Theology not merely impotent, but there is a curious repugnance to it very prevalent. We may hope to overcome this when purely human ideas are more accepted, and their acceptance symbolised by the mother's name. For a mother's love extends to all her children, and goes out with an especial warmth and tenderness to the weaker and less favoured.

When hardier grown we love it less;
And trust it from our sight not needing our caress.

We are, in truth, not really clear of the tribal God, though our language bears witness against us. Our God remains a national God, and the nations are essentially tribes. So the national racial aversions continue, and we call in our God to sanction them and their consequences.

The parental relation I need hardly mention, so pronounced, so engraven on the higher experience of the race, is the superiority of the mother. We do not exaggerate, we allow the primarily selfish character of the maternal instinct, but we see that all advancing human order tends to sway it to unselfishness. Whilst leaving it the force derived from its selfish origin, man's advance tends to raise it from its original weakness and impurity to the holiest thing known to man—a devoted mother's love.

The superiority of the mother idea extends beyond the family. It controls and purifies the relations of the sexes, it will do so more and more. For the antagonism of classes, the jealousies of nations, it is instinct with power. Accept this motherhood as the one final conception, over-ruling all others and applicable to the whole race in time and space; bring it down into all the subordinate relations with its

softening influence. Such is our wisdom. It clears up all our notions, relieves us from all illogical inconsequent complications. It extends through the whole of human life; binds together all the most simple, the most universal affections of men; brings the highest European into a true community with the humblest African—cancelling the discord which has been persistent under the God-notion. It sanctifies the Family, it sanctifies the Country—our Mother Country: it sanctifies the Church. As in medieval times, the temples which replace the cathedral or the church will have this in common with them, that they will be the places of the worship of our Lady—of the Madonna—Notre Dame.

Again, the idea of Humanity as the Mother is cognate with that of the Earth, whom also we call our common Mother. The two in inseparable union sanctify all the activity of man, which uses wisely and beautifies this human Planet. The mother idea harmonises all industry and unifies all the poetic conceptions of art. All the arts have a feminine presentment; the powers which still preside over the adornment of human life are also, in our common language, Goddesses. It is curious how wide a range is given to the idea, how it links all the manifestations of our mental being. Let it serve for an illustration that the groups around the Albert Memorial, representing the four great divisions of the habitable earth, all have for their leading figure a woman.

And for duties. Can we not urge them—and this is what is wanted—as efficiently, more efficiently even, in the new name as in theology? We know we can; and we believe, moreover, that it is the sense that we can which makes so many averse to our Religion. Throughout the various forms of religious institutions by which Humanity has guided the several parts of the race, we can find the permanent elements of an ennobling discipline. That the most valuable means and methods of discipline are to be found in the most recent form—our immediate ancestor—is but a consequence of its being the most recent, depends on its place in the succession of religions, by which it is the product of a riper experience of the wants of our nature. This we allow, and it is what gives its importance to us of the West to Medieval

Catholicism. But this allowed, we are none the less convinced that we are in a new and stronger position with regard to the true discipline of man than any of our predecessors.

For by a careful consideration of our social existence, we can explain and demonstrate our duties—our debts. As so explained and demonstrated they are less easy to evade. And for our motive power we are equally well provided. In principle the same as the strongest Christian motive, the indefeasible claim of love shown for a return of love comes directly and in the visible form of human agents home to all. It needs for its support no cumbersome scheme of redemption with a purely imaginary basis against which our moral sense revolts. Others have done and suffered for us—we must do and suffer for others. And in no personality is all this so powerfully represented as in the Mother's, so that we have but to follow Medieval Catholicism in its later development and to give, under our own mode, a prominence to the idea of the mother answering to that which Roman Catholicism gave. This is most due from us, for our religion springs from a woman's influence. It is but just then that we invoke and honour such influence, that we give it its rightful supremacy, allow it its full effect for softening and beautifying what there is harsh or repulsive in our ordinary life. And as the symbol of this supremacy, we personify the Power we serve under the form of woman, we concentrate all our conceptions of Humanity on the image of her as Mother—by the inevitable conditions of her being the Virgin Mother,—a Mother without associates, a word which connects us with the aspirations of Islam. Once so think of Humanity and it needs no revelation to assure us of her love. The mother loves her children and shelters them—as far as she is able—and her ability is constantly on the increase, for it grows with each addition to her children's power and devotion. As we believe in their advance we believe in her augmented power.

For our mental clearness this presentation of Humanity as the Virgin Mother—the Mother without associates—is of more value than at first sight might appear. Contrast it with the Medieval religious system and you will see what I

mean. That system offers us a manifold and therefore a broken, troubled image, hence the objection of the purer Monotheists to it, an objection most forcibly expressed by Islam. Mohammed recoiled from associating any one with Allah. He sought to get rid of all disturbing images—anything that broke the force of the one central idea. Richer and in many ways truer though it be, in Roman Catholicism we have associates and conflicting claims, with a growing tendency, however, towards the practical supremacy of the Mother. This is seen in the Liturgies, in the titles given her—the Queen of Heaven—the Queen of the Angels. It has put a stamp on the whole of Dante's vision. Still, there must be an implied recognition of a higher power so long as theology remains at all. We can then only see in the mediæval faith a dim anticipation of the ultimate form of human belief when it accords such a sovereign position to the Mother of God.

As we leave theology behind us we simplify all our religious conceptions by condensing them on one image. We can direct our undiverted attention on the one centre, on the spouseless mother who inherits all the attributes of her type so far as they are applicable to man, who stands out alone without compeer or competitor as the Sovereign Lady of this human planet.

The subject is so large, so bound up with all the past religions of mankind, as well as with all our religious future, that we cannot on an occasion such as this do more than offer suggestions. My object, shortly stated, has been to show not only that Humanity is complete as a substitute for the older idea of theology, but also that she best answers to all our wants when she is most identified with the highest type of womanhood; that so identified, her influence over us is most pure and most concentrated in the particular form in which we most want it, as the influence of love, the softening influence which alone can give its full value to our inner religious life as to all its outer manifestations—in this agreeing with our Christian forefathers.

We differ from them in much; but the essential aim of both is the same—the opening human life to a purer, higher, nobler discipline, through the growing assimilation of the

worshipper to the object of worship—the direction in which the religious tradition of the Western portion of the race has been gradually moving, till it has ended in the simplest, most human expression—an expression, however, that lends itself more easily than any other to the most perfect idealisation. To accept this inheritance of our Past, to give it all our assistance that it may command the Future—this it is which devolves on our generation.

It is a great cause—are we aware of its greatness?

‘O Virgin Mother, daughter of thy Son!’ &c.

DANTE : *Par.* xxxiii., 1-22. See p. 519

THE ANNUAL ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE
CHURCH OF HUMANITY, 19 Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C.,
On the Festival of Humanity 100 (1 January, 1888).

NOTE ON IRELAND.

It may be well to add a word or two to the statement in the Address as regards Ireland. The definitive, ultimate solution of Positivism on this point is given in the Catechism (p. 234, 3rd Ed., E. Tr.), where the case of Ireland is but one out of many. It will be seen on reference to this passage that complete separation, an independent life as a nation, is what is contemplated.

In accordance with this judgment of Auguste Comte was the conclusion of my pamphlet on Ireland, published in 1868, the most definite expression of English Positivist opinion. In that conclusion I stated that the fundamental idea of the policy advocated was to create in Ireland a new self-existing and self-ruling unit amongst Western States. A smaller pamphlet issued several years later, *The Irish Crisis*, was therefore no new departure on this cardinal point, but the mere repetition of what I had before said.

The whole political conceptions of Comte are alien to the idea of Imperial union. Empire and Church are in principle antagonistic. A true spiritual power, in other words, is incompatible with large and powerful temporal sovereignties, as an attentive study of European history in the past, and of European States in the present, amply demonstrates. It is a subject on which it is important that Positivists should be very clear and very firm.

R. C.

*THE NEW—THE HIGHER LIFE IN HUMANITY.**

From several quarters, on this as on other similar occasions, I have received expressions of the good wishes of co-religionists. They came to me as representing this London centre, and in your name who belong to it I am sure I may say that we heartily reciprocate them, that we feel for all individuals as for all groups who are with us in our religious work, in our effort to spread the new Religion directly and as a Religion, the liveliest sympathy. I cannot name individuals, but they will accept this acknowledgment. I can name the groups in Calcutta, Liverpool, Newcastle, and Leicester. They share our difficulties and our endeavours, and on this day should be present with us. I would add to the list, despite any differences, the Brazilo-Chilian group in its full extension.

The two years that have passed since my last Annual Address have brought with them no essential change in the general aspect of affairs. They have had each its own proper interest; the first as the year preceding the centenary of the French Revolutionary Crisis, the second as the year of that centenary. Both have directed our thoughts not merely to the historical circumstances of the initial stage of the Revolution, but even more to the origin and consequences of that event, to the enquiry, what has been the measure of its success, what the amount of its failure? We have asked ourselves what was its peculiar work? what is its termination? or is it terminated? what is its place in the upward movement of Humanity? On these questions and on the very diverse answers which could be given to them I need not

* The commemorative form given on pp. 567, 568, applies also to this address.

return now. Rather, starting from the revolutionary crisis as still actual, and treating the whole large movement of which it is the crisis as still the paramount movement, at once veiling and hampering the movement which is gradually superseding it, I repeat it, we see no marked change where it most concerns us to see a change, in the relation, that is, between the forces of revolution and the forces of reconstruction. The disorder is the most patent fact, the introduction of a stable order more difficult to discern. The slight and delicate indications of the growth of such order call for very patient and sustained observation, whereas the tokens of disturbance require no effort to detect them. Still, as heretofore, the outward disquiet must serve as a preamble to the considerations which bear upon its ultimate issue in an enduring calm. Only, our confidence in the attainment of this result should pervade and control our whole conceptions of the preparation. It will be my endeavour to make it do so.

Observing the same general order as on former occasions I begin with the largest of human relations, with international relations in the widest sense of the term.

The international questions of 1888 remain the questions of 1890,—so far as in the natural course of things that is possible. There is greater or less urgency, but the substance is unchanged. An armed peace is still the condition of Western Europe. We can but hope that the current is running more strongly against war, so far as the West proper is concerned. We are told that it is so, but the assurance leaves misgiving, so many are the appearances which belie it. The strain of military preparation is not lessening, even in the West, whilst the danger of collision between Eastern and Western Europe seems to increase rather than diminish. The extra-European jealousy, the jealous watch kept on each other by the leading states of Europe in regard to the possession of the countries belonging to the backward races, most particularly to the African, is also increasing in degree and in extent. It is constantly involving fresh Powers—Italy and Portugal are the latest in the list. All is as yet uncertain, while I write, as to Portugal. We have reason to feel uneasy on this point. The pretensions of either

Power seem unfounded and unwarrantable, and where are those of England to lead her? I have the deepest distrust of, and dislike for, all the current language of assertion in Southern Africa. Where is it to end? The dominant motive for this disregard of others' claims—the claims of the Africans I mean more particularly—is national aggrandisement, whatever the pretexts which mask it.

In our own case, if we are to judge by appearances, the imperial spirit is spreading—at all events it is very obtrusive and impatient of contradiction. Unity of the Empire—the maintenance of the inheritance handed down to us—such is the keynote of the generality of utterances, and with unity is coupled extension—extension in Asia, extension in Africa. The ill-omened, unjustifiable seizure of Burmah we have yet to see the effects of. It is most difficult to get at the facts as to the conduct pursued in Burmah itself, and the degree in which our government is established, but in any case its annexation would seem to be aggravating the central political embarrassment of India—I mean the financial pressure. At home the annexation strengthens the demoralising tendency of our Indian Empire. As an indication of this I instance its becoming the ground of honour to the diplomatic Viceroy, who was the instrument of the robbery of a kingdom. It is true that, if rare, it is not unprecedented, the creation by the Queen of a title taken from a territory outside of England, in memory of a conquest. One previous instance in the present reign occurs to me even more blameable, but no precedents make it palatable in the existing state of human intercourse and when a truer moral sense on such points is so desirable, when, take the race throughout, such truer moral sense is even now perceptibly on the increase. But with our Sovereign no consideration of morality seems to interfere with the satisfaction felt at enlarged empire, at successful violence.

Nor is Burmah the only blot on our Indian policy. I am not alluding to the disquiet awakened in India in regard to Cashmere and other dependent states, but rather to Thibet, with which by our craving for fresh markets we have become embroiled. We are placed, as regards that country, in a position full of danger, as it has been already full of disgrace:

the disgrace of slaughter without risk ; the danger, I mean, of aggression and fresh injustice. There is no other course morally open to us but a free and complete withdrawal from our present attitude towards Thibet, with the recognition of her perfect competence to decline our trade and to reject our intercourse. Rightly does the government of that remarkable country seek to close it against the disturbing Western intrusion. For we cannot too often urge that the West has as yet nothing to offer to compensate for the disturbance it brings with it if admitted. When it is itself wisely ordered, the intercourse of the West with Thibet, as with other outlying branches of the human family, will be beneficial, and we may be sure acceptable. Our hope in this most unnecessary difficulty must rest on the greater moderation which all sound statesmanship, in concurrence with the growing strength of attention devoted to India, prescribes to the home government of India, and, through it, to the Indian government ; secondly, on the gravity of the issue involved in any vigorous attack on Thibet in consequence of the connection of Thibet with China. In this respect, as in so many others, the recovery of power, and consequently of influence, by the Chinese Empire, is an advantage difficult to overrate.

Ireland is still unsettled. Amidst the conflict of party statements it is hard to get at the truth of fact, to see whether there is or is not some improvement due to the stronger hand kept on the social disorder. But we need not linger on such discussions. We are concerned with more permanent issues. For them we may well turn from the temporary strife with its wearisome incidents. Our object remains the same as ever, namely, by a wise prevision to make all immediate policy further the ultimate restoration of Ireland to herself, the constitution or re-constitution of another completely independent unit in the aggregate of similar states, with all the responsibility, all the strengthening influences that attend on such a condition. Ability and vigour may be exerted in meeting present evils, but they must fail of the desired effect so long as there adheres to them the flaw that they are exerted in the interest of Ireland's permanent union with England, and if union, subjection ; the flaw that the whole policy they support carries with it the denial of Ireland's legitimate claim

to self-existence in the fullest sense. I am not speaking now with reference to any popular aspiration or wish of one generation, what is called the national will as expressed by one or more elections; that were to attach undue weight to the Present. A nation or independent state is not a generation, but the chain of generations. Rather, therefore, we should look to the enduring political direction of human affairs, to the sum total of considerations connected with such a question, to the deliberate and definitive judgment of both the parties to the historical connection of England and Ireland. The past of Ireland on its nobler side, demands her separate existence. Think of her as the source of so much of the higher European civilisation, of the Christianisation of the West. The past of Ireland on its less fortunate side renders separation inevitable, for on that side the memories left preclude real union in one state and make independence desirable as the condition of a wholesome moral union with her compeers. The future of Ireland enforces the same conclusion. For the true direction of that future—for its right government—Ireland should stand on the same footing as other states—a sister state. All this without impatience or hurry. It is for the statesmen of the two countries to work out the problem. The essential point is that this end should be kept in view and the subordination to it of all intervening measures be openly proclaimed, and this is what no statesman ventures, perhaps ought to venture, to proclaim. The formation of a body of opinion on which such an announcement might be securely rested is a previous requirement. To help in this formation is our proper task. It follows that the true Positivist policy with regard to Ireland is entirely distinct from that of any of the existing parties. It would keep us clear from complications, and hinder us from connecting ourselves with this or that party leader, leaving us quite free to help as citizens, so far as we could help, in anything that might be an earnest of better things. Utterances of a different tendency in quarters where they are most prejudicial to our general action, have induced me to make these remarks.

It is hard to say whether Socialism, in the more limited and distinctive meaning of the term, is growing or not. There are some indications of a decrease in its intensity, due to the

thoughtful examination which its assertions challenge and are undergoing. The discussions of the two years have not, as far as I can judge, tended to strengthen it in English opinion. Be it so or not, its continued existence as a special movement is desirable, till it be replaced by a truer and more satisfactory conclusion. Meanwhile the object we have in view is to avoid accepting as final any premature solutions. Here, as in government generally, we have to hold back rather than to urge forward, so great is the liability to, so noxious the consequences of, serious mistakes. Some impatience is inevitable, perhaps, in so imperfect a social state, with so much suffering around us. But in regard to Socialism impatience may be restrained, for its propagators are often men of trained capacity and leisure, and on such it is incumbent to have the patient courage required for thorough investigation. We conceive moral answers to be the ultimate and only true answers, rearrangements of material interests to be quite inadequate. It is a new, a social and moral view of labour, of industry in general—that is the real requisite in the intellectual direction. We have to advocate a change in the whole conception of man's industrial action. Thus it is that we insist on a religious change as a previous condition, as alone having enough force in it to enable us to place ourselves at the right standpoint, and, still more, to enable us to meet and discharge the duties our change of convictions prescribes. It is a satisfactory conclusion that the moral feeling on such industrial points is advancing more rapidly than the intellectual conviction, if we take society at large as the field of our observation.

Whatever we may think of Socialism, it is evident that the labour question, the whole of our industrial organisation, is daily centering on itself greater attention. The recent strikes ensure this. The relations of capital and labour, the legitimate claims of the agents of human industry,—of the workmen,—are, through these strikes, imperiously demanding attention. Even too imperiously and exclusively, if we admit that they can only finally be settled as part of a larger and more thorough settlement. Still so much is needed to palliate the admitted evils, that we may see with contentment any reasonable excess of insistence on some partial solution. The

alternations of success and failure to which the parties directly engaged in the struggles are exposed, may have the result of moderating the expectations of either, and by teaching both their relative strength as at present organised, lead to a more searching scrutiny of the conduct each should pursue. Calmness in this examination is greatly aided by the general tone of opinion on the subject, so much less bitter as concerns the workmen than it was even but a generation ago; by the general abstinence of the workmen from violence; by their readiness to listen to mediating counsels, both from within and from without; and lastly and principally, by the essential justice of their demands. For in regard to both the recent movements, the one for improved conditions, the second, of resistance to an attack on their organisation, we, I think, here, hold without question, that essentially the men have been in the right, the capitalists in the wrong. Putting the error in the shortest and least irritating form, it is the absence of due foresight in the direction of industry, particularly in respect of the welfare of their agents, which vitiates all their present management of their great responsibilities. With this error of natural origin and of long duration weighing heavily upon their body, the employers of labour would do well to abstain from any ambiguous change in the actual relations, whilst they seek, by just administration on the accepted basis of those relations, to recover a confidence in their intentions which now is wholly denied them—a denial justified by the theories they have avowed, and by experience of their action.

So far for the disorder in its more general and more superficial features, in its manifestations as between nations and between classes. The survey seems, and is in a degree, gloomy; but there are considerations which may lighten the gloom and inspire a rational hopefulness. In various ways we have seen that hope may be educed from the French Revolution. We have seen that we may shake off the depression arising from the repeated disappointments it has brought with it; that we have reached a point in its course when we may fairly resume the more inspiring attitude with which its commencement was greeted here in England as elsewhere. Leaving it for the present, I would now enlarge

the scale of observation—of comparison,—enlarge it both in time and space. Let us, that is, look farther back than we have been doing of late, and take in a longer period of the anarchy common to all the West. Let us extend our view from what is more exclusively a Western series of events to a series which introduces nearly the whole world into our field of vision; the effort may help us to see in juster proportion what is now somewhat exaggerated from its nearness to us. Let us, then, go back four centuries: go back to the time when the discoveries of Columbus and Vasco da Gama threw open the portals of the West and East—a time when the Protestant Reformation was not begun, and there were no anticipations of later Revolutions. The series so taken connects directly and closely with the Western complications as regards Africa, and overlaps the several important steps in the more avowedly revolutionary period of modern history. Reviewing this period of four hundred years, passing from its remarkable opening events to the present position of human affairs in relation to the same question of Western expansion, we get an extra-European standpoint from which we may judge more truly the intermediate European action, whilst it offers us also in itself thoughts worth consideration. The review will show us that in the time mentioned we have moved greatly; that the actual attainment is great, despite the unpleasant concomitants. The incidental evils which have accompanied the changes inaugurated by its beginning—evils which leave an enduring regret—cannot obscure the fact that the whole result is an intermingling on a larger scale of the several families of mankind, and consequent thereon a growing consciousness of the unity of the race, an intercourse and a consciousness full of promise. The means have been various, the procedure often most blameable, but the outcome—without any vague optimism—is a real advance. Not only is the surface of our planet as a whole better known, but it is also more settled—more ensured against further wholesale disturbances. Violence as the method of change has receded, and is receding from us, if yet far too possible within a more limited range.

Think of it. The two Americas are settled as against any

change from without of a forcible character. Their whole constitution forbids such a possibility. The late revolution in Brazil, which we hail with satisfaction, without venturing, on imperfect information, to judge it more in detail, completes that constitution, and awakens the hope that, even more in the future than has been the case in the past, Canning's words may have their full meaning, and the New World may greatly aid in redressing the balance of the Old. The same may be said of Australia and large portions of Australasia. Asia remains unfortunately open to much disturbance from without, according to the immoral doctrine of a late English statesman, the—I fear it must be allowed—expression of the prevailing opinion of his countrymen; but no transfer of its population is possible, no displacement of any of its separate national aggregates to make room for conquerors. Africa, then, alone is left, and hence the stress of European aggression bears upon her. She is the debateable land, and the eagles gather to the carcase, as she is considered. Hitherto her children have been torn from her. The latest form of reparation for that great and acknowledged wrong is to tear her from her children. But objectionable as is the course pursued, it is yet true that it is the beginning of the end, that with the settlement of Africa, whatever the form that settlement take, the earth's surface is practically all settled, and the territorial conditions for a more unbroken order fulfilled. So much, at least, has been attained by the four centuries which I have taken.

This statement of the broad general result carries in it the point on which I wish to fix attention, the closer inter-connection, that is, into which all the leading divisions of man are now brought, and the sure ground for hopefulness which that inter-connection affords us. In the natural instinctive advance of Humanity so much has been achieved towards unity, and the spontaneous tendency to which the advance is due necessarily and fortunately continues. I say fortunately, because the rational guidance, on a large scale, of human policy is perhaps still distant. Distant in application, that is: in conception it lies open to the world, traced with distinctness, and gradually, we may not doubt it, writing itself on the thought which will direct the future.

Keeping to the same general subject, I might draw a like conclusion in favour of hopefulness from the external action of Western Europe. I content myself with the shortest hint. Its greater intellectual and material strength confers on it an acknowledged leadership, or at least a leadership in which all acquiesce. The simultaneous assertion of Western supremacy by all its representative powers, is, you will see, necessarily calculated to draw out the consciousness of the claims such leadership may appear to warrant. Evil and immoral as I think the form worn by the actual assertion of those claims, there lies in it the germ of better things—a germ which is visible in the objects avowed, with more or less sincerity in the avowal. The claims in fact are passing into duties. If increase of dominion is sought, the responsibilities which attach to dominion are in word at least not repudiated, and we have reached a period at which the professions of the rulers, whether statesmen or people, are brought home to them with increasing force by discussion and opinion, so that the duties may become paramount, the claims sink into comparative insignificance, and as a more distant consequence, community of external may bring greater community of internal action. Its tendency in this direction is seen by the statement of the Prime Minister, who is also the Foreign Minister of England, the statement that the main business of the Foreign Office at present is concerned with South Africa. The internal community of Europe is, I need scarcely add, secured by its diplomacy. The natural result of the simultaneous affirmation of their superiority by the several states of Europe is to evoke a sentiment of a common mission, the first step towards a right estimate of the legitimate method of fulfilling such mission.

Again, the existence of a special socialism in this or that, or in all Western countries, does but attest the fact that throughout the world active interest is being more and more centred on social as distinct from political questions. In the hurry of very accelerated motion, the several forms of progress crowd and jostle one another, each consequently remaining disorderly and imperfect; the disappearing not sufficiently disappearing, the form destined to grow unable to emerge, to express itself satisfactorily. Allowing for this

confusion we may yet be confident that the general voice of the thinkers is not mistaken when it announces the above conclusion. If accepted, it points in the same direction of greater unity of the race. For in the sphere of the social all its portions are, and feel to be, much more akin than in the political. Neither is there so much direct friction—there is friction enough. As the political pass from the scene, the sole motive for inter-disturbance of the earlier, more forcible kind passes with them, and in peace the several existences created by the past—the nations—may perfect, in harmony with the permanent, uniform constitution of man, their own social order—each helping the other, but with complete exclusion of all domination.

Labour, again, and all its problems, are they not universal, and, as such, do they not point to unity? Have not these latter years proved them to be so more convincingly than could be the case in earlier times, when men were not brought so near to one another? We are constantly being reminded of the connection of the labouring population in all its ramifications. We have seen an instance of the force of such connection in the maintenance of the Dock Strike by the contributions from Australia. Very imperfect as yet we must allow is the ordering of such connection, and, as imperfect, very weak for its purpose, but the beginning has been made, and the inevitable constant accession of life and vigour in the industrial direction of all man's energy, must urge forward what is yet at its mere beginning, the corporate action of the agents of industry.

In what I have been saying I have treated the various subjects on one method. I have looked on them as all equally portions of the unsystematic advance of Humanity, and have wished to show that they all equally, whatever deductions may be made for imperfections, have an element of hopefulness in them—for that they all bear witness to the progress of the race towards a higher, more social existence. To enhance the value of such inference, I have not shrunk from the darker aspects of the picture. Whilst not avoiding these, the main object of my address is the appeal to a confident hope in and through Humanity of a new—a higher life. If we can trace a progress towards it through

the anarchical present, through international hatreds and strifes, through inter-racial aggression; if we can see it underlying creeds, socialistic schemes, and the antagonisms of industrial life—if in all we can trace it slowly impressing itself on the whole troubled existence of the race, we may feel that such hope is not unwarranted, even by the sad experience of the past, and may return after so much apparent waste of effort—after the discouragement due to repeated failures of partial attempts—may return with fuller understanding to the buoyant sense of hope and joy which preceded the revolutionary crisis.

But there are other grounds for our hopeful expectation. We may emerge into a clearer atmosphere than that in which we have been moving, whilst engaged in the present trouble, with all its absorbing and distracting interest. I could not but speak of it, for it gives us the impulse to seek better things, to rise above it in order that we may the better understand it and guide it; in order also that we may avoid the influence for discouragement to which we are too apt to succumb, the Slough of Despond which meets us at the outset of our journey, and which we see so constantly fatal to the would-be pilgrims. We ought on this her great Festival to stand before Humanity in her entirety, and so compress the Present into its more limited significance by the combined Past and Future.

We hear around us something of a demand for a new life, a higher life. A new and higher life has been the constant aim of Humanity, ever persistent, if at times more consciously pursued. It has been the aspiration and prayer of all her servants, whatever the form of their belief, whatever the character of their existence. It is inherent in the race. We have, in reference to it, but to extend to the social our knowledge of the individual organism. As each one of us, by the laws of his bodily existence, grows into fuller life, so is it with the race. Occasionally the evidence of such growth has been more on the surface of things, more visibly present to all. We mark such times as important advances, epochs of progress, from the more rapid rate of movement. But the difference is only in degree, there has been really at no time any intermission of movement.

It may not be without profit, however, to dwell on some few of the more marked epochs in order to show their agreement in this respect under many differences. The history of the West will suffice as to these epochs with a word or two only devoted to earlier stages. We must not forget that in the period anterior to the Western Transition we can trace the upward tendency of our species in the days of its simplest childhood. In or for the next stage of its being we are gradually coming to the conviction that the great priesthoods, whose action is even now so sensible, all had in common the desire to introduce unity and order into the life of man, so as to place him on a much higher level than that which he had previously occupied. This conviction had been obscured by the revolutionary doctrine and feelings, but in this century it has recovered to a very great extent its deserved weight. It is an acquisition of our generation on which we need not go back, but accept it as an acquisition which simplifies all our reasoning, and frees us from many of the difficulties which vitiated the judgments of our predecessors, whilst, by the continuity of purpose which it establishes in this highest domain, it sanctions all our feelings of sympathy with the religions of the past. Abandoning, then, the intellectual and moral hostility to a priesthood as such, which was so rife even within our own memory, but which is gradually passing away under the influence of sounder historic conceptions, and accepting as established that the primeval groundwork and the theocratic order which was constituted upon it were each in its own way inspired by the desire to raise to a nobler form the life of man, we may centre our attention on the passage of the West from that early constitution of human society to the definitive social organisation. This social organisation it is which lies before us to complete; into the possession of it we of the present generation have entered. Under every aspect such attention, if given seriously, would offer us a large measure of satisfaction as to the results attained, despite the evils of the process of attainment. It would certify to us also the entire community of aim which unifies the whole Western tradition.

One and indivisible in its object, the Greco-Roman period,

through the combination of intellect with action, issued in the attainment by the Western portion of mankind of a truer idea of human life under its social aspect. It gave practical expression to the speculative conviction that peace is the normal condition of society, peaceful industry man's normal activity. This was an achievement of the utmost value. It was not reached without great suffering; when reached, it was not long enjoyed in any complete degree. But it has never lost its power; it was, under all the disasters in which it seemed to perish, a possession for all time, leavening all subsequent political conceptions, at once a guarantee and an aspiration. It had rooted firmly in men's minds the value of order; it had shown to the higher minds on what a large scale love might be the principle of human union even under the then conditions. Such briefly stated, as for my present purpose suffices, was the outcome of the centuries of war and conquest which preceded the Roman Empire, the creation which was the compensation for the effort of its establishment.

It was incomplete, but its high and humanising influence was the guide to its completion. The unity attained pointed onwards to a higher unity. St. Paul completed Cæsar, the Christian Church completed the Imperial State, the lower form merged in a higher form of union. The love, which was a consequence of the enforced and then voluntary union in Rome of so many nations—a love only visible to the higher minds as the principle of such union—took its rightful place as the leading principle of all action. It threw off all covering, and was proclaimed in a form adapted to the then state of things as paramount over the powers which had hitherto been supreme.

Centuries passed before the consequences of this change were fully seen; but in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the laborious effort was over, and the constitution of Western Christendom both in Church and State stood visible to all its members. Again the achievement was of the utmost value; again the suffering which had gone before it had been great: less even than before of permanent enjoyment was accorded it. But there was compensation for the sacrifices by which the end was gained; for of it, as of its predecessor, we may say that it has never lost its power; that amidst all the

disorder attendant on its decay, it remains a possession for all time, as far as the essential conception is concerned; that it has affected, and still affects, all subsequent thought and action; that it, too, is a guarantee and an aspiration: that it has shown conclusively to the Western World the capacity in man for progress; and has placed beyond the power of dispute the aptitude of love, when grounded in a common faith, to be the cement of human union.

As with Rome, so it was with the Catholic-feudal order. Both have left us an inheritance; but their relation to us is, with much similarity, in a certain degree unlike. The Feudal Catholicism of the middle ages was the compensation for the troubles and sufferings of the centuries which preceded it—the centuries in its case of the break-up and resettlement of Western Europe. As the Roman, so was its construction precarious and short-lived, even more short-lived. Both were incomplete, and both pointed the way to their completion. So far alike, they do not differ merely in time, because, that is, one is the later, and therefore through it is transmitted the influence of the earlier, with additions as would be natural. Neither is past for us; but Catholic Rome—the Rome of the Papacy—is much less distant, concerns us far more: enters more into our whole conceptions and life than imperial Rome. By virtue of the principle on which it rested, which it existed to assert, it is inextricably bound up with our own effort. It is, for us who belong to the third term of the Western progression, the first solution of the problem to be solved—the problem of the definitive construction of human order. It was the sketch, the outline, the study for the finished work, which is even now inaugurated. This relation of our religion to that of the middle ages explains our admiration, our love for them, our adoption of them, which are a stumbling block to many.

Fixing, then, our attention on our own religious movement, the last Western construction—the third term in the Western series, when that series is reduced to the uttermost—we find its course similar to that of the two which have gone before. A period of decay and trouble, and consequent suffering; a long and wasteful effort, but not without much to lighten it, especially the growing hope of reaching finally

a great end—an end dimly seen but persistently pursued; such has been the antecedent state—the state from which we are emerging. There was no reason to expect that it should be otherwise; but there is also no reason—quite the contrary—to expect that there will not be the same consequent as before: that there will not be a compensation for all that has been endured. There is ample ground for hopefulness, even to those who most dislike the destructive process through which we have been, and are, passing. Irrespective of any special character or form, all may count, and do count, on the establishment finally of a new order. For us there is more. Our proper attitude, if we are imbued with the true sense of our advantages, is beyond hopefulness, except in relation to the severe pressure of present difficulties. For we really are in possession; the order for which all are looking, though they look to different sources, exists already for us. It is around us, moulding the present; not in the distant, but in the immediate future. We may live by it, work from it, help to draw it out into fuller light, and establish it as the guidance of the reluctant generation in which our lot is cast.

In relation, then, to the higher life of Humanity, the contribution of Rome was the drawing into closer union of many distinct portions of mankind, the strengthening the sense of affinity, the desire and the hope of unity, through peace and concert within gradually influencing those without.

The contribution of Catholic Feudalism was the building on this groundwork of Rome a spiritual union, on the foundation of love as the direct, the acknowledged principle of union, not as the consequence of such union. The Religion of Humanity is identical in aim, it is in entire harmony with Catholicism as to the principle of union and as to the spiritual character of the connection of mankind. In partial abeyance for a time in consequence of the exigences of intellect and practical life, love resumes in the Kingdom of Humanity her rightful pre-eminence. The supremacy of feeling, such is the truest characteristic of the Positive religion in the eye of its Founder. Hereby it is the completion of all the earlier endeavour of man. For the East, which represents order, rests on love. It is sufficient to

point to the strength of the family bond, a strength inherited from Fetichism and reduced to system by Theocracy. The progress of the West has led it often too far from this binding principle, but on examination, in its more general conclusions, it may be seen never to have wholly discarded it; it has, in short, been constantly drawing nearer to its realisation. As in the Christian times, the world is now again setting towards love, dark as the Present may appear.

The supreme impulse of love ensures us the new, the higher life, which has been the central thought of what I have been saying. For whether we take the simpler, more condensed language of the great Apostle, or the fuller expansion of Thomas à Kempis, equally for both, with love all things are possible, it is a power that never fails us. In and through the love of our common Mother Humanity, we, when duly penetrated by it, shall transmute all our existence into a higher form, higher as more complete and by virtue of a more thorough intelligence of all its conditions. It is this completeness which justifies our preference of our Religion, as it was the incompleteness of the Medieval Religion which accounts for its failure in the face of all the marvellous self-sacrificing love which its sainted men and women displayed, which their followers are even now, I doubt it not, often displaying. We can imitate, we can emulate them, we can hardly surpass them in depth of feeling, but we have the advantage over them that by a wiser direction of feeling we may ensure its continuous power throughout the whole future, dreading no intermission, no decay of the order we found upon it, no ulterior substitution at great cost of a more satisfactory faith.

And now, what is this higher life which we, the disciples of the Religion of Humanity, hope to reach through her? I need but shortly indicate some leading conceptions, beginning with the larger and more general. We adopt the Christian tradition and repair the Christian failure. Peace on earth and goodwill to mankind have never as yet been more than an aspiration. By the strong pressure of the Past on the Present and the Future, we are sure that they will become realities. A great security will settle down upon the world, in place of the disquiet which so chills our action. Under the

sense of such security, the one sole object of our active energies may be vigorously pursued—the controlling, viz., of the Earth to the use of man. The co-operation towards this object, well understood, will dignify industry and tend to the union of its ministers and agents, by inspiring both with the feeling of a common, if in form different, purpose, and with respect for each other's equally indispensable contribution. Thus become a natural source of harmony instead of discord, with due allowance for imperfections, industrial life will admit and promote a proper ordering of the remaining parts of human existence. It will evoke, it is seen every day even now to be evoking more and more, our intellectual faculties, whether for science or art,—for the increase of our power, or the beautifying its results. Its better arrangement will leave scope for, will conduce to, the right disposal of our truer life, the life of affection. Making a primary object of the security of the workman's condition, and through it of the security of the family, it will give practical sanction to the conclusions of theory, that it is in the family affections that we find the great constituent of human happiness, that life is, as it has been said, the energy of love. Secured and permanent, instinct with this loving energy, the family draws on each member to qualify himself more fully for his peculiar function in it, that so the agreement of the parts and their perfection may perfect the whole, so linking our personal morality, our personal happiness, the most inward sphere of each of our lives, with the simplest collective unity above us, and linking them by no forced process, but in the most natural chain of events. Such I conceive to be the conception which will take the place in the future of the aspirations after higher life, as embodied and beautifully embodied in the various evanescent forms of Medieval belief, more particularly embodied in the Medieval Monasticism, which we would commemorate with honour, but which has no longer any social applicability.

On the particular means by which the Positive religion seeks to attain the ends attained by the Monastic system, the elevation of the whole being by a stern but most beneficent discipline, I will not now touch, further than to say that it does institute an analogous discipline—one essentially, how-

ever, self-imposed, not given us by external rule, so that the Religion of Humanity sanctions and promotes all the deeper religious feelings and aspirations which have been the strength and the stay of the existing theology. It consents not to any lowering of the religious ideal—it but alters the form.

I know not that when estimated aright—and my hearers can supply what is wanted in the outline I have given—the purely human order, in state, in family, in personal life, with a spirituality explaining, stimulating, and connecting all, a safeguard against stagnation, a pledge of general aims and of generous feelings, is in any one point at a disadvantage, when compared with the mixed constitution it supersedes; that with due relation to our nature and wants it fails in any way to meet the requirements of man. Such right estimate is, however, yet to come for the generality of mankind. We, to whom it has in some degree come through the teachings of Auguste Comte and through the inspiration which we draw from his example, have it as our great obligation to aid in its formation around us, to further its general acceptance. Persistently, if quietly, we may discharge such obligation. It is a pleasure to feel that such a discharge of it is on the increase amongst us, that without presumption we are awakening to our responsibilities. I speak of the whole body which is in connection with the religious effort of Positivism.

In all that I have said I have wished to keep before myself, and to present to others the hopeful confidence that in the power of our common human Mother there is the assurance of our reaching to ever higher forms of life, that we need not stand apart from her in seeking such higher forms; that in short it is solely in and through her that they are now to be sought. Whilst confronting the present gloom, and alive to the unhappy lot of our weak and unfortunate generation, which can neither go backwards nor forwards with decision, I have steadily followed my leading idea—the unity of Humanity and the consistency of her action in pursuit of a higher existence. It is not on great occasions only that Humanity interferes, as was the attribute of the powers she created and has set aside. By her very idea, it is an even gentle pressure which she exerts unintermittingly; a pressure which, gentle as it is, gathers momentum by

continuance, till it becomes strong to push aside all obstacles. In connection with this leading idea, I have led you back from the present to the uprising of the great Being, to the massive march of Humanity with centuries or tens of centuries for her steps, with full retention of the acquisitions which marked each step; at each step also issuing into more distinct consciousness, till the preparation over, she is revealed to man, led to her throne, as we heard last night, by a countless train of generations centering their transmitted influence in one supreme genius. We celebrate in trustful love her advent. We are present at her enthronisation.

Strong, or as yet weak in faith, we all, in our degree, have faith, and now, as always of old, it is faith which prevails. Faithful and Hopeful, the two characters should be fused as we move onwards on our rather solitary path, both having an ample justification in the Power we serve. Shall we fall behind our religious forefathers? They have left us as religious an inheritance which we may well seek to maintain, to which no evil association clings. The devotion and the love which they gave to an unreal shall we not give, in at least equal degree, to a real Power?

O Virgin Mother, daughter of thy Son! &c.

DANTE. *Par.* xxxiii., 1-22. See p. 519.

THE ANNUAL ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE

CHURCH OF HUMANITY, 19 Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C.,
on the Festival of Humanity 102 (1 January, 1890).

COMMEMORATION OF THE DEAD.

I shall but remind you of considerations familiar to you through the recurrence now for several years of this closing celebration of our annual Positivist worship. The thoughts it excites must be substantially the same, the utterance alone varying. In some respects it is the simplest of all our ceremonies, and the easiest to introduce, as it is deep-rooted in the habitual feelings of man, in the practice of our medieval forefathers, as in the practice of those who, having abandoned the medieval faith, still retain its customary observance of a particular day. We continue in the same track, changing the day however and placing it at a time more consonant with the spirit of the institution; changing also, by an enlargement, the character of the commemoration. We raise it to a social act and give it a real catholicity, without depriving it in any degree of its foundation in personal and family regards, in this as in all other cases avoiding any breach with the past, whilst freely revising that past, and adapting it to the new conditions, imposed by the developing consciousness of the species. This by way of preamble.

Humanity speaks to Her children in many ways. This evening She speaks to us through Her dead—Her servants who have lived and worked and passed away, leaving the fruits of their labour to swell the sum of Her influences. It is the voice of Humanity's Past which should be in our ears. As elsewhere, so now, She speaks to us first through our personal and family affections. Our own nearest touch us most, are most with us habitually, are most easily recalled so as still to form part of our lives. Our closer knowledge makes it easier for us to bring them before us with all the good there was in them, to put aside with loving reverence any thing that was less good; to feel the force of their

example, of their words of gentleness and love; to understand by the simple direct power of natural affection on one side what it is we mean when we say that the living are more and more under the sway of the dead. Hence the strong wish to continue their lives in obedience to all that was highest in them—the wish not to be unfaithful to their memory.

We speak of them now only in the general. They are private memories, sacred to each or common to the members of the same family, but not passing beyond the family; often, in the present lax family order, they are not common to all the family, but confined to the members of the family as individuals, and cherished by one perhaps with an adoration but imperfectly shared by the rest. As we form ourselves to the devotional habits which our religion urges us to recall and institute, they take their place in the daily worship of each believer, giving it the real inward foundation on which to rest securely the worship of the common Power—Humanity. As so recognised, they are a gracious influence to each, and their recognition naturally acts upon each as a bond, connecting him with others. Reviving the better family memories in one after the other, it draws them all with a latent yet strong impulse to revive also the community of affection, where it has been dimmed or lost, or at the least it softens our judgments, and tones down the asperity which life may have, as is too often the case, occasioned.

Thus even within the innermost circle of our existence the beneficial action of the beloved whom we have lost may extend from a personal to a social influence, raising the individual and uniting him to others. No result could be more in consonance with the wishes of the dead, no tribute we can pay them more grateful. In paying it we shall feel in truest communion with their spirit, a communion without a drawback, capable of almost indefinite enlargement, linking us more closely at once to the dead and to the living; a communion, moreover, fraught with practical good results on our lives. In their presence, that is, we revise all our past and examine our present action, conduct, and feelings, and importing into such revision and examination the calmness and freedom from bitterness which attach to the dead,

we learn to correct ourselves where we have been wanting, and to see more truly our duties in the present. In a word, we learn that we have to live as those should live who will be to others the dead, and who as such would wish to carry on to those who shall be as we now are, the holy influence we derive from those who now are what we shall be. For such is the chain of human existence, such the true tradition of the generations, such the true life of the servant of Humanity. Thus whilst we still keep to this innermost circle, to the family, we restore its power for good where it has been lost, we place it on its true footing where it has been indeed continued, but not without various evil elements of pride or other forms of selfishness intruding into it. And the circle naturally tends to widen. The more close family expands, and in the usual order of events grapples to itself other families which contribute their members as objects of our commemoration and adoration, their contribution constituting for us a more varied and more wholesome guidance. It is in keeping here to introduce the Positivist family and the memories, both for the year ending and for previous years, which on this occasion it recalls, memories both sacred and inspiring, occupying an intermediate position between the strict family and the next collective existence, so that there is an easy transition to the next way in which Humanity speaks to us, when it is no longer the Family to which we are confined in submitting ourselves to the government of the dead, but we come in view of a larger whole, which may have different forms, but which is sufficiently expressed for us by the term Country.

This second mouthpiece of Humanity enlarges and corrects the first, while it brings new thoughts, new influences, new associations to bear upon us. It gives a fresh, more inspiring meaning to the voice of the family, to the sway exercised over us by the dead who belonged to our closest, most restricted sphere. In its own proper right it associates us with the land on which we are born and with all the feelings which our just love for that land should and does call forth. Whatever there has been of great and noble in our country's past clings to the names of her children who have lived and died for her, who form, known or unknown,

our national inheritance, who have made our country by their labour and their suffering. Here again in the calm serenity of the atmosphere through which we trace the memory of our immediate forefathers, we can separate them from what there was of imperfect and excessive in their life's direction, we can, by the very nature of our adoration, which seeks to purify ourselves, purify their aims and legitimately embellish their memory.

As the more prominent names in our country's story, the more illustrious of England's dead, her spiritual guides,—her thinkers, her priests, her poets—her leaders in action,—her kings, her statesmen,—pass before us, we see the circumstances of troublous conflict in which their work was done. We see it, but we can now set it aside and unite them by a reverent view of them in their deeper underlying community of purpose. Very often, it is true, it was an unconscious community, often even one which in the heat of contest they would have disclaimed, but still one which we can trace by the light of the common result and by a juster understanding of their conditions. We may regret that there was wanting a better mutual estimate, a calmer insight into the issues placed before them. We may regret this, and warned by their example we may seek to attain what they missed. We may endeavour whilst the discussion and the actors are still with us to judge them fairly, without waiting for the compulsion of death to impose charity upon us. But we can abstract our views from the dissensions which sundered our forefathers, and unite them, so far as they are deserving of honour, in a common honour.

Nor is it only the illustrious dead whom we recall. It is but just and right, perhaps too, better for ourselves, that we should dwell on the humbler memories in which our country's past abounds, on the numbers numberless of those who in quieter and lowlier station have trodden unflinchingly the path of duty, and whose joint effort has built up for us in so large a degree the order in which we live, and from which, with all its imperfections, we derive so much good—all of us some good, most of us a great deal of good. Of these numbers our recollection enables us to have present before us some types, enough to represent the rest and to take away all

vagueness from the tribute we offer. We can recall men and women whom we have seen and known, who in the every-day, ordinary course of life, without any self-consciousness, worked their daily work and suffered and lived for others. Their example comes most home to us, touches all most nearly as drawn from the common, more universal walk of Humanity's servants, with no exceptional distinction, but with the sole light of dutiful service thrown upon it. At the same time it is, by the mere fact of the superior number engaged, the more important constituent of the past. As daily, so to speak, the charm and power of the outer world, of the natural environment which surrounds us all, grow in importance under the advancing thought and the enlarging feeling of the race, guided by the teachings of our poets and painters, we come to be more aware of the extent to which the beauty we drink in is the creation of the labour of toilers throughout the generations, a labour unceasingly directed to the improvement of our land. As again, even after due allowance for misuse and very imperfect direction, we feel, as we cannot but feel, the greatness of England's resources and power, the means which our country has at its disposal for noble human action, the same thought recurs. We are indebted for this gift to the patient and unenviable toil of generations of unknown workers given ungrudgingly for the common good.

So we commemorate our country's dead, so we listen to Humanity speaking to us through them.

But She has a third voice. She speaks to us through those who are more emphatically Her own dead, through the aggregate of the great spirits who carry us beyond the country, beyond the limits of one or more ages, who represent to us the more marked stages of human growth, all the higher forms and agencies of man's social existence. I speak of Her illustrious servants whose effigies are ranged around our walls and characterise our worship, who present in concrete form our doctrine, and remind us under varied aspects of our duties and conduct. They are of one age in their joint result upon us. They act in entire concert, completing one another, rendering definite and perfecting by such concert the presentment of Humanity, perfecting or

tending towards its perfecting, yet in complete subordination to Her. As Her course lengthens, She rises more and more above Her individual servants, above their conjunction even. Their peculiar glory consists in their enabling us to feel Her greatness more adequately. They are inseparable from Her, but it is through Her and Her acceptance of their services that they derive the honour they enjoy.

This third voice necessarily stands first in importance, from the very simple consideration already urged that it is common to all, that it calls us away from all limitations of time or country, and places directly before us the universal bond of our human community. It includes, corrects, and enlarges the others, which without it might, and too often do, deviate into separation. It has the additional advantage of raising us into a serener atmosphere. Not merely does the sight of the great spirits exalt us, but it frees us from the sense of sorrow. In the plenitude of their triumph we discard the depression which is too imminent elsewhere, and are conscious only of the great satisfaction which the success of their accordant labour offers us in its contemplation.

Here again however, and in strictest connection with the smaller group of the highest names, we are bound to remember the humbler memories, the mass of unselfish, obscure servants of Humanity, who in different countries, and throughout the Past, have worked towards the result which we enjoy. Singly they may have brought but little, but in their numbers they have contributed most, more than their greater fellow-workers, who, without them, would, it must be remembered, have been powerless. To give precision to this notion, let us recall a familiar observation, which records that as a general rule great men have had great mothers to whom they owed largely what they were and what they did. Then compare the roll of the illustrious dead of Humanity, on which women do not appear in great number. In the primary and secondary orders none appear, they afford no types, that is, for the months or the weeks. Supply in thought this defect, and call up the countless women who have given their existence to the service of their race. The extent of their contribution to its welfare is at once apparent, as is the justice of the feeling that we should

hear and listen to the voice which issues from them, and should consecrate their memory. And yet they are but one constituent of the unknown—obscure, by name unremembered, dead—who have stood around and upheld the more eminent by one agency or another, by their active services, their approbation, their tacit appeal to them through the sense of fellowship to exert all their powers in the furtherance of the common welfare.

And from whatever side we approach the dead, from our personal recollections, the memory of our country's past or from that of the whole human family, we cannot avoid the thought of those who have not a claim on our commemoration from any merit and as due to their willing unselfish service. We cannot but remember the wasted products of the evolution of Humanity. As all other organisms She is subject to the process of renewal of Her substance, the constant change of Her elementary constituents. The generations are passing, old materials, in this case individual human beings, are ever flowing out from Her, new materials, new individual beings, flowing in to fill the vacant spaces. In the rapid outgoing and incoming, the adjustment is very imperfect, the quality very mixed, the waste in Her case, as throughout the plant and animal world, very great. In infancy, in childhood, in youth, the particles of Her organism after a short incomplete union, separate and disappear, often with a deep sense of loss from the early promise given, but in all cases without time allowed them for any full service.

Nor is this the only or worst form of waste. Her complex existence is inseparable in its growth, will be inseparable probably throughout time, however great her advance may be, from a certain amount of disorder. Her separable individual elements are also prone to disorder, easily miss their difficult object, the harmony of their conflicting natures. By outward circumstance and by inward constitution Humanity in Her elements is constantly exposed to trouble. As She moves onwards to her final state She removes more and more from Her the evils which oppressed Her beginnings, and which still attend on Her at Her entrance on Her maturer age. But, whilst getting herself clearer from them, She cannot wholly extinguish them. Thus it is that as we listen to the

voice of her Past, the voice of the Dead, we are aware of the discord arising from the very great admixture of unworthy self-regarding existences who have so far as any conscious service is in question given none at all, who were in fact the servants of self, in other words, of evil. Yet unconsciously they have served, and in any case their existence was a necessary concomitant of Humanity's and claims a certain tribute from its being so.

Whilst, therefore, we have at this annual celebration more to do with achievement than with failure, to glorify the noble rather than to speak of the ignoble, we may yet let a note of pity and regret mingle with our expression of honour, of regret for the waste, of pity for the numberless existences which have fallen short, have accepted no portion of the common task, have not trodden in any better path, but have been mere adjuncts of the true human life, in no sense integral parts. Passing events recall forcibly this numerically large constituent of social existence, and if they do nothing else, may at least indicate the better way of meeting the problem of the residual and apparently hopeless elements of society. The existence of such a body the older religion has always seen, if at present it is more keenly alive to it, and more roused to consider its treatment; our own faith sees it, and must deal with it when it has the power. There is a general arousing of attention to it, an inquiry as to the proper methods of action, a considerable amount of practical exertion. If I mention it here, it is because such action towards the living examples of the state alluded to cannot but bring with it compassion for the dead who were not so treated, who have passed away comparatively unregarded.

Sorrow for our losses, sorrow for the waste, both find a place in our celebration, but they cannot be its dominant idea. It has a firm grasp on the present; it is a forward-looking ceremony in which we unite this evening. It is the formation of one of the two great constituents of our common Mother that we really commemorate, and so great an operation should raise us to a corresponding height of thought and feeling, now that by the teachings of our Master we are enabled to understand it. For what does

it amount to? Is it not to this: That we now have intelligent possession of a solid government which we can examine and obey, a groundwork for all our advance, the indication of the direction which our efforts should take; lastly, a guarantee in what has been accomplished that future labour shall be full of accomplishment? In the Humanity that has been we read with certainty the promise of the Humanity that shall be, when under more deliberate control and wiser guidance She avoids the mistakes of Her Past and justifies its hopes, its noblest anticipations.

If it is memory that we invoke to-night chiefly, it is memory pregnant with inspiration, lighting all the centuries which lie behind us, but throwing forward also a light on the path we have before us. It is a memory which impels us to the strongest sympathy. It is a memory which is throughout communion, our communion of Saints and our communion with the Humanity who accepts and consecrates them, and to whom they lead us so far as Her effort in the past is concerned. For they take all vagueness from our conceptions of Her. Every form and vicissitude of Her existence finds a representative in their number, or one from whom we may carry ourselves back to the condition which is but imperfectly represented by any single name. From their labours and sufferings as they pass singly before us we can pass to the sum of labour and of suffering which Humanity has evoked throughout the period of Her life which she has traversed. The mingled sorrow and triumph of that period—the suffering and victorious Mother—are vividly presented by the names or results of Her servants.

Quite naturally do we thus pass to the Festival of to-morrow. We are placed by our commemoration in the right attitude for it: one of the two subjective constituents of Humanity is now brought before us. It is the indispensable preparation for the other, the unseen and yet seen host of the church triumphant—*la schiera del trionfo*—of the servants whose warfare is accomplished but whose service is not thereby ended. Rather is it but just beginning so far as any determinate recognition of it is in question. It has always been there, been rendered we know. But it must gain much in power when it is consciously acknowledged and

is made a part of each healthy human life, a daily influence among all the pressure and trivialities of ordinary life. This truth has been felt and has operated powerfully in all or most of the previous religious systems, but it has never before been placed on so real or so large a basis as now, when all the better memories of the dead without any limitation to this or that age or country are blended into one imposing concert. In this sense it is true that the influence of the dead, their true service, is but just beginning.

At this point we stop, for at this point the proper thought of to-night attains its completion. As by the honour paid to mendicity in the ultimate worship we accept and turn to use, by consecrating it, one of the imperfections incident to our condition, nay more in the person of the eminent Saint who is connected with it we pay it great and merited honour, so by to-day's commemoration we give its right interpretation to the highest imperfection, the most painful of our human conditions, to the law of death. We submit, as we cannot but submit, to its unavoidable pain, the terrible suffering it brings with it by separation, but as we pass from the narrow to the larger conception we see the social compensation which attends on the personal loss. We see that we cannot restrict ourselves to the individual considerations. Our present celebration inculcates this hard lesson.

By it, in fact, we are placed on an eminence, a Pisgah height, on which we may pause for a time and be thankful for the gift given us by the past, survey it in its large proportions as in the richness of its promise. In the softening, tempering influence of such survey we may forget, or at least accept, our own deprivation, and enter in thought on the inheritance of our people, the enduring possession of all posterity. Thus we carry on to its final acceptance, to its extreme consequence, the law which we proclaim as the guidance and inspiration of our lives—the law of living for others.

Collectively then we gain the victory over death, whatever the personal shrinking. Collectively we justify the language which spoke of the institution we hereby perpetuate as the *Festum* omnium animarum, the *Feast* of all Souls, as we also can justify the term we ourselves have received, the *Festival*

of all the Dead. Very difficult is such an attitude to us as we are, it may be that it will always retain a certain difficulty, the degree in which it ceases to be difficult marking the progress of mankind in regard to its external conditions. To all, nevertheless, this collective justification may impart a degree of strength. As we advance in social feeling our submission to the common law, our renunciation of the separate, in view of the universal, interest, will become more habitually a part of our mental constitution. As we realise more fully the subjective life and its power we shall draw from death as the universal law its true moral—the duty at once and the happiness of so living that we may not, in Dante's words, lose life among those who shall look back on us, who shall call this time the old time. Such is the social, the noble feeling that should run through the succession of human ages.

A word or two more on this important question, on our way of looking at the Past, on the frame of mind in which we should stand before it. It has been said: Let the dead Past bury its dead. I quote the familiar words not to cavil at them or contest the truth which they convey when taken in their context, but to use them for my own purpose. To us the Past is not dead. Its dead live for us, they are not buried but risen. We tend to look on them somewhat as the aged Hieronymite of the Escorial looked on the sainted figures which the painter's skill had placed before him and his brethren; 'they are indeed the substance, we the shadow;' so powerful are they over us. The ever-augmenting element of Humanity which they constitute fronts the Future through the Present, fronts it and commands it as from a height whence we trace the lower grounds and the streams that water them. And we who stand at the point where the Future is passing into the Past, we have an existence which is a compound of the two, into which both enter with power. The old Roman Deity who presided over the opening month of the later Roman year, the two-fronted Janus, who bore the inscription: *præterita respicit, futura prospicit*—looks back on the things that have been, forward to those that are to be—is an apt representative of each of us. The two frontings are an inseparable appanage of man in his proper nature when his human existence has asserted its just superiority over his

animal. And the human attains its proper level in proportion as the full significance of this double relation is seen, in proportion as man in fact rests on the past for guidance, in proportion as he appreciates its beauty and its rich gifts, as he regards it with venerated love, fed by both his intellectual powers, his contemplation, and his meditation.

They tell us of the beauty of the southern night, when the din and glare of the day being over, the earth lies in the profoundest quiet, in the repose of midnight. The night there is not more than the absence of day; darkness but not gloom; not blackness, but a darkness which leaves the objects we knew by daylight, city and field, traceable in softer outline. We can still discern the scene of ancient industry on which man for centuries has lived and laboured, and above the labours of man there is the face of heaven, with its full magnificence of stars in their southern clearness and brightness. Some such impression is that which the Past should have constantly for us. It bears in its bosom the effort and the cultivation of man, it has received and accepted his ceaseless continuous labours, it is overspread with an atmosphere of calm. There has been toil and conflict, but they are over, and their results only remain. Above all that lies buried in its folds there is seen the host of its great spirits, the stars in the firmament of history, shedding light and glory on the solemn stillness.

Into their noble company we are as it were admitted, that we may love and reverence them. But not for this alone, but that we may draw from them courage and the strength requisite for our task. It is with us as with Dante. From the serene air we pass into a climate vexed with storms, but the converse with the majestic race of eminent authority is well placed at the beginning of the journey, which for us, as for him, leads through evil and purification to the Triumph of the Future.

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE

CHURCH OF HUMANITY, 19 Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C.

on the Festival of All the Dead 102 (31 December, 1890),

*HUMANITY—THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD.**

From several quarters, on this as on other similar occasions, I have received expressions of the good wishes of co-religionists. They come to me as representing this London centre, and in your name who belong to it I am sure I may say that we heartily reciprocate them, that we feel for all individuals as for all groups who are with us in our religious work, in our effort to spread the new Religion directly and as a Religion, the liveliest sympathy. There are many who are not with us but who are for us. There are more than we know of perhaps who are strongly with us. I cannot name individuals, but they will accept this acknowledgment, wherever they are—in Europe or out of Europe. I can name the groups in Calcutta, Liverpool, Newcastle, and Leicester, as also the Brazilo-Chilian group in its full extension. Where we have no special greetings, we may safely assume their presence with us in spirit. All share our difficulties and our endeavours, and on this day should be present with us.

I will not linger on this occasion on smaller and more domestic issues. They are numerous and I do not contest their importance or their interest. They force themselves upon us only too much and must have occasionally their treatment. To-day, however, when we come more avowedly into the presence of Humanity, I would make choice of some two or three larger considerations connected with her present and her immediate future as a prelude to our religious homage to herself, the proper object of our meeting. In short, I shall proceed from the point at which I stopped yesterday, when

* The commemorative form given on pp. 567, 568, applies also to this address.

the constitution of her Past was the introduction to her plenary recognition in the generation for the time being.

In the exertion of her power in the present Humanity speaks and works primarily and principally through those existences which stand nearest to her, and which do so as in their nature most like her. I mean the larger constituents of the actual generation, by whatever term you designate them, Empires, Kingdoms, Republics, States, or Nations. On these her more immediate organs I would first centre attention, and most of all on the great group of such organs known as the Republic of the West, the collective but discordant power which influences so powerfully the whole of contemporary activity. My first point, then, concerns international relations. And all that I have to say on the present occasion in relation to the mutual action of the greater wholes gathers around this central Western body and its conduct, so far as it conducts them, of human affairs.

It has been said that on such questions the time is rather destitute of interest. It may be so to others, it cannot be so to us. To us, as occupied with a complete change, bent on forwarding a reconstruction of human order, no time can be without a living interest, independent of temporary excitement or incidental complications. In the year we have left behind us, the West has asserted its domination as opposed to its wise leadership—the European West I mean, which alone acts directly on other populations—sensible and increasing as is the reaction of its extra-European part. Not by any formal act, the decision of an European Council, but in informal concert, the Western States have systematised their occupation of Africa, carving it out at their pleasure with the most complete disregard of the claims of its natural inhabitants. They have, in fact, taken possession of Africa, so far as it is possible for them.

The same thing has been done before. That is true. The division of America, its assignment, continents and islands, to Spain and Portugal, by the Papal power, the occupation by France and England, and at the outset by Holland, of the portions which escaped Spain and Portugal, the principle that the first European discoverer of any fresh country was justified in taking possession of the discovered

land, equally whether it were inhabited or uninhabited, for his sovereign or state, all exemplify in the past the same supreme neglect of the claims of the actual possessors.

But, the date and circumstances taken into account, the recent action of the European West, which claims to be the vanguard of Humanity, is peculiar in its shamelessness. We have seen it stated that within its own limits the relations of its powers are coming more and more under the guidance of the golden rule of doing to others as you would be done unto. It may be so. In all the stronger contrast stands out the fact that in informal concert they are all engaged on the same course of plunder, that between coastland and hinterland the theory is fairly complete on which these civilised states combine to spoil Africa in the interest of their own material well-being as they conceive it.

I have often heard it said : Why is no voice raised against this misdeed, this abuse of power, with the probable long train of evils which it entails on the agents, with the almost certain over-balance of evils which it entails on those who have to submit to it ?

My answer is that we cannot command a hearing,—that does not depend on us,—but that we have spoken. We have never been silent on the misconduct of our country in this respect, on the monstrous wrong of which she has been guilty on so many occasions in our own time in continuation of the ancient wrong. Without forgetting her repentant efforts in regard to slavery in her own dominions, or to the extinction of the slave trade, we have blamed her for her constant policy of repression in Africa, for her crushing every movement of self-exertion, the formation of any spontaneous, and therefore valuable, nucleus of independent life, on however imperfect a scale. Were it in Ashantee, in Abyssinia, in Southern Africa, or in Egypt, on each occasion, as the representative of the Positive Religion in England, I have spoken freely the condemnation which all higher human morality accords to such oppression. And now when the other states of Europe, her compeers, are condoning the wrong by participation, we are free to speak no less decidedly in condemnation of their action, as in condemnation of her acquiescence.

So much in justice I may claim, speaking for English Positivism. But my present object is not so much to insist on the wrong as to trace any compensation there may be in its form or in its consequences, prior to dealing shortly with the whole question from the human standpoint. As regards the form, the compensation may be found in the watch the powers concerned will put on one another. This may lead them to harmonise in some degree their practice and their better professions, whereas singly they might act in entire disregard of the latter.

In its consequences the openness of the wrong offers us this compensation: that it urges on a process which is already begun, the awakening of the conscience of the West; that it promotes a fuller inquiry into the whole problem, how to deal with the weaker or less advanced members of the one human family. For under so many appearances to the contrary, we may be sure that there is an advance continually to a better estimate of the Western obligations in this respect. Feeling and understanding are both working towards a more beneficial intervention which shall moderate the evil tendencies of the policy we have been reprobating.

I have spoken of Africa most particularly, for on her attention is centred just at present, but I would not confine my remarks to Africa. They apply much farther. In fact, Africa stands here as a representative name, a condensed expression for the various uncivilised or belated populations wherever found, in Africa first, then in Australasia, Oceania, North or South America. These populations have been almost invariably treated as subject, or as a legitimate prey, at times exterminated by violence, or worn down by more insidious means, the vices or the importations of civilised man, at times contemptuously pressed into the service of the stronger as slaves, or the equivalent of slaves. The African contingent has but the longer sadder record of maltreatment in and out of its own home to distinguish it. For all alike, a new mode of regarding them and of treating them is required, especially the former. Consistent energy is needed in this direction, for in the administration of the planet, in the right direction of human affairs, no question takes precedence in extent as in importance of the protection and patient guidance of this

large constituent of coexistent Humanity. And this holds good, as is becoming manifest, in two directions, as concerns the races in question in the first place, as concerns the higher interests, in the second place, of the nations which are claiming dominion over them.

The connection of this question with to-day's Festival is direct. Humanity, as she gains in power and recognition, extends her protection and includes all her children. Their claims become more audible, their claims to justice, patience, and kind treatment. These in the first place. But more is due to them; they are entitled to be made by wise methods participant in the benefits which the more favoured portions of the human organism have derived from the common Mother, and to be so made participant by the voluntary action of those portions.

To this conclusion, through much hesitation and weakness, the better reason of the West is gradually advancing, and its advance is being quickened by the insight into the actual treatment of these populations which each fresh disclosure affords. The remarkable growth of the universal sympathy with man in all conditions which has taken place in our own time, receives a most useful stimulus from every record of excesses, whatever gloss may be thrown over them by self-interest or by moral perversion. They force upon us in all its brutality what is too often meant by the process of developing Africa, to use the current language of industrialism as applied to that continent. We are compelled to see the dangers which attend on enterprises undertaken amongst weaker races, when the wholesome pressure of civilised society is removed. In the absence of the usual restraints the lower instincts gain the upper hand.

Apart, however, from all such accidents, there has come from various sources a growth of the purely human idea—a fuller recognition of the unity of man. The notion is acting with accumulating weight on all that concerns the mutual relations of the larger organs of Humanity. Implicitly all are looking more and more to indications deducible from Her existence as the only guidance available. The guidance they offer is reluctantly accepted, too often in word disclaimed, but still it is accepted, so far as in our present weakness any-

thing is accepted beyond a simple irrational drifting. Neither regret nor blame for what is faulty in the present conduct should prevent our seeing this underlying tendency. The effort should be to draw it out, set it in its true light, give it greater force and consistence, till it end in an ampler practical development. It is much if in the unseemly rush of national rivalries and commercial competitions we can point out a hidden principle of unity. It is much if we can indicate the change which might redeem the trouble consequent on such lower impulses—if we can show that such a change is neither far off nor entirely alien to the present, but lies involved in it and demands no more than that we should explicitly admit that which we implicitly even now accept. On such explicit admission sooner or later action must follow in correspondence with the admission. In the end the logic of human advance prevails. So that if we admit the unity of Humanity and place ourselves under the sway of the central truth of all wisdom, namely, the conception of Her as the whole of which all societies of men are parts, with relations to one another and duties flowing from such relations, the examination of those relations, the enforcement of those duties, supersede at once all the haphazard notions and practices which are actually in the ascendant. The servants of Humanity accept the guidance thus offered them. They find in the relations and duties a power due to their reality—a substantial rational support for their enthusiasm. They find in them the connection of all that is most human in past policy with the most human side of the present. So the impact of Humanity on all her organs, recognised as a fact, is concentrated and strengthened. It becomes the guarantee for the close of the disorderly, the entry on the orderly administration of the world's affairs.

So again, if we look to the industrial order, we reach the same general conclusion. And this industrial order stands in a very close relation to the international question on which I have been speaking. For it is in the name of industry that all this iniquity in Africa is being perpetrated, all the other motives, the more sonorous pretexts advanced, are but partially and secondarily active. It is not to Christianise,

it is not to civilise Africa, that the West is taking possession of her. It is for the extension of commerce as the instrument of each nation's aggrandisement that the raid is made, and as a wholesome diversion of internal difficulties. Industrial disorder presses from within, industrial ambition stimulates from without. The expansion of Western European activity is due to the double impulse.

But it is a wider question than the African to which we are introduced when we turn to human Industry—it is one coextensive with all contemporary Humanity. It is under this largest aspect that I touch upon it here, as evidencing the unity of the race, and the enlightening ennobling power of the true human conception.

It is the common interest that the earth should be duly cultivated, that all that it is capable of yielding in man's service should be wisely and carefully drawn from it, with the proper reconcilment of the interests of the present with those of the generations for which the present is in its day the trustee. It is the instinctive if ill-directed sense of this duty which gives dignity to the modern industrial effort, and which justifies in men's eyes the methods which are adopted. But in man's combined exertions, no less than in his individual nature, the social is the weaker, the personal the stronger impulse, and the blind industrial fervour which is urging on the Western population is but too generally the outcome of the purest personal greed. It is something, perhaps, that it seeks to veil itself under more specious forms, but its true character is not concealed by any disguise. In both the developments of industry, whether we look on it, that is, as the concern of private life, or as the collective action of the various nations, in both alike we see that there rests upon it, deeply ingrained into it, the stain of personality, of selfishness, the mark and badge of its servile origin, the insignia of thralldom. Clearly enough seen in respect to ordinary industrial life, this character is no less impressed on collective industrial existence. What are customs, hostile tariffs, protection, but so many evidences of it, examples of the jealous, separating, nationalising, tendencies of industrial life? We have to recognise these unpleasant facts, but we have to see whether they cannot be surmounted, whether the

social element in industry may not be made to predominate. That it may do so follows from the true conception of industry. For in obedience to the true permanent interest of mankind, however repulsive the forms under which it is presented, the industrial or the highest form of human activity, which is coeval with man's existence and is ever advancing in honour, requires the willing contribution of all the race. That it should be willing is the proper aim, but length of time and consequently great patience are necessary for the attainment of this aim, and it is sought to avoid both, to force the process. It is the sum of the conditions under which such co-operation is given that constitute the Labour Question, as it is the harsh injustice of those conditions which constitutes its danger. Hence its bearing on the whole planetary population, hence the solidarity of all the workers which is increasingly felt. Over the whole surface of the earth it is then of importance that the right conception of labour should prevail, that the full assertion of its just position, of its inherent dignity should preside over its whole treatment—such position and dignity flowing from its very nature as the contribution for the time being of the living generation to increase the sum total of the inherited results of labour, and to transmit them, so increased, as freely as they were given, to be the inheritance of the coming generation.

Here, again, is seen the illuminating power of Humanity, illuminating and guiding. In the light of her existence her toilsome children, who have with such a noble instinct served her through the long ages of the past, are enabled, and will gradually avail themselves of the privilege, to change their instinct into a rational consciousness, to see in its true light the task which devolves upon them, to understand that their labour is participation in a truly human work. Enforced by the conditions of man's existence on earth, conditions which are shown to be really favourable, if in appearance harsh, Humanity raises labour, as being her proper outward function, and offers it for the voluntary acceptance of her servants. They, by such voluntary acceptance, ennoble themselves and their offering. Far as the present is from such a state, deep as is the gloom which as yet rests on

human industry on the larger scale, the newer thought is fusing itself into it, the presence of a larger hope is making itself felt; the special agency being, I repeat, the influence of the newly revealed power—the recognition of the guidance of Humanity.

Again, admit this central unity into the treatment of the industrial problem, and one by one, through the consecutive and sustained efforts of the thinkers who are working at that problem, all the minor issues will find their settlement, and the growing disorder of man's active world will end in some approximate order, satisfactory beyond present expectation if still bearing the stamp of an inevitable imperfection. It is in the tacit, inherited admission of principles of a wholly different kind that lies the main obstacle to this great advance. Clear such principles away consistently, supersede them by others drawn from a different circle of ideas, in perfect keeping with the broad, observed facts of human life; shake off the clinging associations of the state we are leaving, and emerge into the ampler, more life-giving atmosphere of the state which is even now existent around us—this is the change which is really called for and on which all depends, a change of the standpoint from which we regard the whole subject. Herein lies the true direction of all our energy as brought to the treatment of industrial questions, that we begin not from below upwards, a dreary and, as experience shows, a profitless way, but from above downwards, from observation—yes—but from observation of the higher social phenomena and nobler impulses, not from the observation so exclusively directed on the individual and self-regarding antagonisms or tendencies of the actual industrial world.

Political or rather international action, industry—both these subjects have been approached from one side. In both I have sought to show that one power is at work opening new horizons. My third point deals with opinion, and that again in the most enlarged sense. I would by no means confine myself to any one country, nor to any large division of man. I would shake off all the local restrictions of our English life, even all the influences of the atmosphere of Western thought. I would take in all countries which can in any sense be said to contribute to form the world's

opinion. For my contention is; that here again the unity of Humanity is making itself felt, that the habitable globe is being engirdled, not so much by 'one hot electric breath,' as by the current of an opinion influenced and formed by the concurrence of all its inhabitants, the expression of the feeling of the whole, at once absorbing and correcting the more limited contributions of the several parts. This is only carrying into the intellectual world the train of thought which has been followed in regard to two provinces of human action, tracing in a third province the growth of the subordination of man to Humanity.

Not more surely is it necessary, if we would understand our planetary system, this world of the sun, to leave the earth and take the sun for the centre from which we study it, than it is in our study of the current of human thought to look at it under the light afforded by the one central truth, not to approach it from one or other of its special manifestations. So placed we can judge more truly of the partial currents, the affluents of the main stream, which are on no account to be neglected, but to be estimated by their relative importance. And so judging it we shall find that the one paramount direction of this collective opinion is purely human, the aim which it has in view being the right ordering of this human world, with no reference to any other, that Humanity overrules all dissidence and unifies all previous divergence.

Whatever the teachings of theology and whatever power they yet retain, they cancel one another as viewed from our central elevation, and the direction of this world's affairs stands out as the sole object common to all, the true aim of the endeavour of mankind. This was to be expected as the natural consequence of the separation, in the past, of the several constituents of Humanity. Each has had its distinct tradition and training. As the separation lessens and the union begins, the distinctions tend to disappear, the common possession to assume its due prominence. And all have in common one identical nature, and an identity of relation to the Earth which they inhabit, whilst their ideas as to the source to which they should look for guidance vary widely. They not unnaturally leave aside the varying

ideas, and fall back on what they have in common. Other forces tell in the same direction, but we may for the present neglect them, and conceive of the opinion of mankind, its judgment of the present wants, as swayed by its common evolution of one central idea, its attainment in common of a sense of a common interest, by virtue of a common nature and a common environment.

There has been, that is, a long training in isolation, but when the isolated elements meet and mingle in common action they use only what they have in common and throw away the distinctive, assuming the common as the basis of action. Were but the European West well-ordered and awake to its duties, it might wield an almost incalculable power in consequence of this community of opinion. A truly human policy in dutiful submission to Humanity might then be inaugurated.

As it is, it is working blindly forward to such a policy, not without some dim foreshadowings of its ultimate destination, but unwilling to accept the doctrine which determines that destination, repelling all notion of the submission above mentioned, and therefore not gaining the light it would give. It is content with such amount of light as it cannot avoid admitting from the new thought which is fermenting. But we may be confident in the power of Humanity to change this blind reluctant advance into a conscious progress. Seeing the change already made, we can have no doubt as to its continuance and added momentum. It is a new life that is circulating throughout the nations, the parent of new creations. Humanity is shaping our ends, rough hew them how we will. The growth is tumultuous for the time, control is not yet attainable. The spiritual evolution needs a spiritual centre of direction ; in the absence of this fundamental requisite lies the explanation of the irregularities which are but too painfully characteristic of the movement.

None the less is there the movement and the promise it bears in it. None the less is the outline of the power which is to direct it before us, shaping our thoughts towards its embodiment.

The Humanity of the Present has been occupying us,

her growth in power, her wider recognition, her illumination. We have looked on the actual generation as more informed by the consciousness of her, and therefore more active in the propagation of her influence, but still as imperfectly awake to its true relation to her, as submitting in short to an impulsion which it has not assayed and which it scarcely understands, but also from which it cannot free itself if it would. The leaven of a new revelation is working in it, mainly through the influence of its author, partly also through his disciples who proclaim it. This living agency must not be overlooked. It is not what it should be, we confess with sorrow, but it exists and counts. We are more likely to under-rate than exaggerate its value, so obvious is its weakness, so great its comparative insignificance. It cannot but be, it should be, present to our thoughts. Nothing can deprive it of a real importance, for such as it is it is the direct organ for Humanity for the time. Its voice proclaims Her advent, and the altered conception of all human life which follows upon that advent. The voice of its members may be feeble if taken singly, but in conjunction it has its strength—and it must inevitably gather strength—for it is the voice of a real power—there is a force behind it. It is the expression of a will hitherto latent but more and more apprehended. So supported it requires but few to utter it. We need not therefore be anxious about our number or disconcerted by our personal weakness. It is the union, not the number, that, as our Master teaches us, is the important point.

We may seem to stand alone, at least in great isolation. Were the isolation greater than it is, it need not discourage. Solitude whether individual or collective is not, never has been, necessarily weakness. It may be made the source of strength. It has been said to be the parent of genius, and the essence of genius is the single eye, undimmed by the mists of contemporary error or prejudices, and resting unaverted on the great permanent truths which are the common property of all the generations. To this result our isolation may be made to tend, if we use the freedom it gives us, its power to bar the inrush of impressions. We may be invigorated not depressed by it.

True there are certain deficiencies entailed by our position

as the first walkers on a new path, for instance our deficiency in ritualistic and poetic development. The fact is so. We have to begin as our predecessors did with the bare truth, unset as it were; that is, without the setting which it is to receive in after times, with little of outward beauty or magnificence to cheer us in the present. We feel the want for ourselves, it is borne in upon us by others. Yet we have something—much even, if we look more closely into our possessions.

The first Temple of Humanity must be for all time the room in which the sacraments of Her religion were administered by its founder. In germ this, the first avowed Church of Humanity, is the second. We worship, as others in connection with us worship, in buildings which are in germ Temples of Humanity. We, and those who share our belief, are the germ of the living Temple which her collective believers will form. We have beautiful music, if our circumstances, particularly the dispersion of our members, as yet prevent our having the hymn. We have a very simple but still real service. We have the power upon us of our associations, to heighten resolve and to kindle faith. We have more. Ordered as it is this room offers more. In it we require but a slight effort of imagination to hear the voice of the past generations, for the busts and portraits on our walls speak to us if we will listen. We can by a similar, if somewhat greater effort, hear the tread of the coming generations. We can turn in fact from the defective actual presentment, and gathering together all the resources we have inherited, we may well be content in our day. At the same time we exert ourselves to hasten the oncoming of a better outward condition for our successors. Not blind then to the defects, we may take comfort in the thought that, when all is said and done, it is in the first disciples that the greater faith is manifested—and faith can transmute all by its touch; can be its own reward, a sustaining and a creative power.

I am aware, I feel, that there is a certain amount of discouragement around me, a decreasing faith, a disparagement of the results attained, a decline of the religious conviction as distinct from that which is social or political. I see slackness and falling off from unsteadiness. The subtle

influences of our unsettled milieu work against us, its caprice in action, its arbitrariness in judgment, all its moral and intellectual indiscipline. Again, the slowness of our advance chills the enthusiasm of some. I wait for, I look for the renewal of earlier zeal, the stronger when renewed because tempered by the trial it has undergone. But I am also aware and feel that there is another and a more hopeful side, that longer familiarity with our Religion is deepening its hold on many and ensuring their persistence. Most direct evidence of this reaches me from time to time. Were it not so I should not be discouraged, for I feel that the years must have told, that we are stronger than we were. Any judgment that I can form warrants me in counting on the action of time as having wrought in our favour. It warrants our looking on the decade on which we enter to-day as certain to confirm this view, to bring us increased power, with ample opportunities for its application. It is not hope on which I rely, but the conviction of our strength. Our greatest want is cohesion.

So far for the present of Humanity, whether relating to action, thought, or our own position as her avowed servants and worshippers. In what more remains to be said I shall proceed with a train of thought which I began on a previous similar occasion, the approach to it being different.

It is not without reason that the theology around us insists on the idea of sonship as the relation which is the root of all other relations in its religious system. We might trace it as such root in many other forms of theological belief. In Christianity it lies on the surface. Memory easily recalls many expressions in which the relation is dwelt upon. One may suffice: *Our Father*. The beauty and reach of the idea are undeniable. We do not question them whilst we reject it and replace it.

Historically, within the circle of the Christian ideas, there have been two directions taken by belief. In the one the movement has been towards the divine, in the other towards the human. It is the last with which I have to do here, the one which, with a certain necessary reserve, transferred the supreme influence for man to the Virgin Mother. She was the creation of the succession of Christian generations, restoring the sympathy between the worshipper and the

worshipped, which the full absolute divinity of her Son had impaired. It is to this tradition of medieval Catholicism that we affiliate our own belief as the children of Humanity. We even adopt it as an institution of the transition state, adopt it into our provisional system of worship, aware however of its transitory nature, and using it as the foundation only for a more definitive construction.

By our adoption of this tradition of the Virgin Mother we are led not to regret the filial relation, but to change the designation of the parent to whom we are related as sons. Ours is not sonship in a common Father, but in a common Mother, the sonship remaining. And we need not fear the comparison which we thus challenge. The new form gives precision and unity to the whole of our religious conceptions; it presents us with a consistent order throughout our life—an unbroken uniformity of relation. As members necessarily of a family, necessarily in thought at least,—whilst we know the sad truth that in our troubled social state many are born to whom the family is unknown—but as members of a family it is the Mother who is for us the highest power we know—the source of our consciousness of love. Sonship in the Mother thus begun in the Family, there is no break as we move out from the Family into the larger relations. Our Country is the common Mother of all her families. Humanity is the common Mother of all the countries. Throughout, the name is unchanged, the continuity of thought maintained.

The idea of the father, of the fatherhood pales before its rival. There is a curious emphasis being laid on this idea as if in consciousness of danger. Islam and Christianity are meeting in the emphatic assertion of the Fatherhood of God and in deriving from it the Brotherhood of Man. This last term has no difficulty in relation to Humanity. The difficulty arises when the aim is to connect it with the Fatherhood of God. It is a consequence of this difficulty that the two terms must in theology always remain more distinct than with us. When *we* speak of the Brotherhood of Man we feel that we are but naming Humanity under a special aspect.

Christianity cannot by any breadth of interpretation wholly discard its claim to be a remedial system, a

redemption, a restoration to a father's love of a being who has fallen from that love. Take away the ideas of Fall and Restoration and the whole scheme dissolves. Children of wrath, such was the older language, the familiar language of our childhood. If the advancing consciousness of the race rejects it now, it cannot so entirely banish all that it involves as not to imply an interval between the so-called children and their father. We are, in short, only by adoption the sons of God. No such notion is admissible in our relation to Humanity. We are born her sons, part of her being, we are in fact what we are solely through her, in no other way is our existence explicable. So much closer is our relationship in the latter than in the former case.

Even under the barest theistic hypothesis, turn the matter as we will, all tends to the same conclusion in regard to theological sonship: that it is a privilege accorded by a Being outside man, his creator—it is a relation founded on the will of that Being. Whereas the sonship in Humanity is an inalienable condition, the necessary consequence of the fact of his birth, a relation which is independent of any will, and beyond our power to terminate.

Despite, however, all fettering by theology, from the wants and the wisdom of man there came the assertion that God is Love. It is the noblest formula of theology—a formula which, as I must think, under the latent growth of the power of Humanity, has of late tended, and will more and more tend in the immediate future, to supplant all other statements, maugre the resistance offered, and logically offered, by the adherents of the system of Christian doctrine as heretofore accepted. For it is a social necessity, if Christian theology is to retain its hold on man, that it strip itself of all its more distinctive attributes and compete with its successor on the broad common ground of love. I need not dwell on the obstacles to its success in this course, obstacles created by its past, by the documents on which it rests, by its own beautiful creations in thought and practice, by the facts of man's condition on this planet, by all the results of the science and activity of man, by its own sometime strength, and by its actual decline and weakness. Nor need I insist on the practical objections to such a

course. The value of the more complete theological system has been as a discipline of man, and to that discipline all its logical doctrines have converged. In its newer, vaguer, undoctinal shape its power for discipline, its governance of man's nature—even its rallying power—will be enfeebled if not annihilated.

Be this as it may, I take the formula as it stands, and ask what is the meaning it conveys to us. So examined we may read in it an anticipation, a vivid expression of the conviction that the true principle on which man must rest for all the higher purposes of his existence is love. Some personal representative of this truth was needed before the advent of Humanity; when She has come She is its natural representative and the other fades away. None the less, however, while we recognise all this, are we grateful for the shelter offered man in the past by the ideas which he is outgrowing or has outgrown. We can see the wisdom that supplied such shelter; it is in no spirit of scorn we look back on our fathers' belief. Most particularly can we watch it with gratitude and veneration as we see it unfolding in the course of ages, drawing nearer and nearer to man, lessening the harshness, and giving fuller expression to the tenderness of the provisional guardianship instituted. We see it not debarred by any inconsistency in theory from intensifying the love which is man's truest element by transferring, or at least, delegating its expression, changing it in fine from a father's to a mother's love. By a necessary limitation we are aware that this mother's love must remain subordinate in power, an influence rather than a direct sway, but not the less so limited is it apt to be a type of that which it prefigured. As the higher thought of mankind on its constant upward progress has no hesitation as to the superiority of the mother's love, it will more and more sanction this direction of the medieval cultus, and our own conclusion which adopts it.

All the future must deepen this conviction, for to this result all our efforts are directed. The triumph of the mother's love is due, if we examine well the facts of human existence, to the greater closeness of the relation between the child and mother. This is in part a consequence of the long

infancy characteristic of the human species, the care of which infancy devolves essentially on the mother. Hence, wherever the family is rightly ordered and the mother occupies her just position, the attachment between child and mother derives strength from the whole aggregate of circumstances, and the right ordering of the family, the assuring of the legitimate position of the mother in the family, around this aim centres all the endeavour of the new Religion. The more deeply we penetrate into its spirit, the more consistently we seek to arrange its doctrines, the more shall we find all in closest connection with this endeavour.

Thus prepared we can use the new formula that Humanity is love, taking the old as a preparation, an anticipation, as approaching the love of Humanity through the love of her vicegerent, the common Mother's love which is her inseparable attribute. And we reach this truth, I repeat, by no uncertain or vague method, but as the necessary consequence of our experience, both collective and personal, by the experience of the race which places the mother's love as the higher, by the experience of each of us in whom the power of love and the sense of it draws its origin from the mother.

Nor is there anything to forbid this conclusion if we once think correctly what Humanity is. It is the hasty, thoughtless interpretation of the name which is always at the root of the rejection so commonly occurring. It requires some effort, in most cases more or less conscious effort, to grasp the right interpretation. But it may come without conscious effort, will perhaps so come more and more as the name gains a greater hold on the familiar language of men, becomes an accepted, a quite usual term, and therefore one in regard to which men look rather to the consequences deducible from it than are inclined to return inquiringly on its origin and meaning. As this becomes the more common state, the difficulties and objections now raised will disappear without our knowing why.

Nor is love only the inseparable attribute of Humanity. More than this. Love is of the very essence of the idea of Humanity, for without it her existence is impossible. This will be seen if we examine the process of her growth, her gradual formation. Range in thought over her long upward

course, from her first weak beginnings. See the family in its first stage with an element of affection tinging the strong personal instincts which keep it together, balancing them and often triumphing over them. See the family joining other families to form the tribe, drawn into this larger union by the power of social feeling, mastered by the innate tendency of man to look on man as akin to him, as a source and an object of friendship, of affection, in short, of love. Other motives concur, it is true, but at bottom human association is voluntary, a natural desire, a desire resting on the heart, not on the intellect, for its impulsion. And so the tribe swells into the nation and the nation into the empire. For on reflection we shall see that this is the real explanation of what is generally solved by the theory of the ambition of conquerors and their lust of dominion. This is the real explanation, I mean, of the constant tendency in earlier times, as exemplified in the five great monarchies, for instance, to enlarge the social union. The movement took the only method then open, the method of conquest by war; but in the contented acquiescence of the conquered, in the large toleration of the conqueror, we may see the true source of the continued aggregation. We may see that it met the real requirements of the race.

Idea and history coincide, then, in support of the statement that Humanity is love, that she is rooted and grounded in love. From such origin it follows naturally that her energy, if I may use the term as expressive of the operation of a being so formed, that her energy is love, that she lives and works as a loving power for the shelter and advancement of her children. She mitigated what there is harsh in their destiny even whilst they were blind to her existence, still more does she mitigate it when they work in submission to her and with her. She is always raising them to new heights of conscious power over themselves and over their environment. As her authority is more recognised, her true nature more deeply felt, the instinctive setting towards one another which under all counter action has been the governing, overruling course of the various portions of mankind, their association, their closer union for a common purpose—and their association and their union not on the basis of their

wants but on that of mutual goodwill, of increasing love,—all these tendencies in direct keeping with all the truest and most organic previous efforts of men will receive an impulse of incalculable force, be subject to a slowly working but irresistible pressure, deliberately applied.

So but faintly traceable in her earlier condition, evidenced only by the results after a long succession of ages, then becoming more and more patent till the higher minds were able to grasp it and express it in language and in action, the principle of love which constitutes Humanity has at length emerged from all that veiled it. It claims complete supremacy, asks no longer for recognition but demands idealisation. When will the poet, under whatever form his poetic power expresses itself, awake to this demand and bend himself to the fulfilment of the obligation it imposes? Whilst waiting for this special fulfilment and for all its fruits, life offers all the disciples of Humanity, whether as groups or individuals, the opportunity of its fulfilment in a more general sense. The highest art is always the fashioning of men, the forming life to a poem, to use the noble language of Milton, and from this art-exercise none are shut out. As it becomes a commoner acquisition, the environment will be provided in which the true special poet will find it easier to work out his work, the very atmosphere he breathes ministering inspiration.

But if Humanity is love, and because she is love, she is also light, the true light of the world—*Lux Mundi*. I again approach my subject from theology, our thought being predominantly historical, never dissevered from the past. We are aware, that is, that the term is claimed, and by an exclusive claim, for another, a claim for which the support of experience is pleaded. It has been recently urged anew, not without some force, but not without at the same time an undernote of tremor. The faith in it is felt to need reassuring, needs to have its reasonableness demonstrated under the newer circumstances. To this feeling of the need for a re-statement which shall justify the allegiance in which so many are conscious that they are wavering is mainly due the success of a series of theological essays, so alien in form and topic to the prevailing thought of the world. Men cling

to the old from habit and social motives, and they would gladly have it shown them that they are right in so clinging. It is a singular sign of the difficulty of the position that this well-meant effort to satisfy the above demand is met on its own side by a loud condemnation, as increasing the danger, as a surrender in fact to the hostile force of the very key of the fortress.

In this instance as in the former we reject the claim for the Present and the Future whilst ready to allow it a certain validity in the Past. Partially and with most considerable limitations, the personal Christ, he too the gradual creation of the succession of generations, has been a light to the world. We see on what they rest who would uphold his claim. Were it worth our while, when we can find what we want so much better elsewhere, we might get good from their manner of reasserting it. But we reject it and supersede the claim; in fact, we see in it only a particular manifestation of the wisdom of Humanity, evolving a personal type to take her place whilst as yet unseen and unformed. It was the embodiment in a special creation of her light. Now the part disappears in the whole. She inherits all that has been in turn attributed to others. She inherits in fullest inheritance the appellation in question. She is the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. She is the indwelling light, to borrow a term especially favoured by one of the noblest Christian sects—one in many points very near to our own conceptions, I mean the Quakers—the indwelling light which is a portion of man's being as man—in other words, as one of her children.

In more daily English, it is the common feeling of which all are participant that has been the source of the fruitful exertion of human reason, the source of light, which has ever been more fruitful in proportion as the feeling gained in purity and comprehension. The change consists in that we now need no longer any external representative; that Humanity, by our sonship in whom we are partakers of this light, is now our all-sufficient guide; that the social Christ replaces the personal.

By their fruits ye shall know them. Contrast the two interpretations of the one term—the *Lux Mundi* of the older,

with the *Lux Mundi* of the newer order. Contrast the subjects which the two respectively offer to our rational examination and as food for our higher feelings. Not a word would I say of a contemptuous character, nor would I deny that some of the subjects we have in common, so far as the name goes. I instance—Faith, the Sacraments, the Church. But as a whole we feel that for us and for the world in which we live, as soon as we take it in its full extent, the world of the nations, not of one limited and peculiar country, we feel, I say, that the subjects and their treatment have lost their interest; only by a great effort and under peculiar traditions can they have any force of appeal to us. In studying them we feel compressed as in a closer atmosphere, and escape from it into the open air, the fresher breeze, with the feeling of relief and pleasure which it was so difficult for our veteran statesman to understand.

As a source of intellectual or moral inspiration the older *Lux Mundi* is then closed to us. Those who uphold it do not really speak to us. As a guide to practical attainment it scarcely offers anything. There accompanies it rather the misgiving that it should offer much, but cannot. Its vindicators scarcely touch the complex order in which the living generation walks in disquiet. Against their will and unconsciously, theology exerts its isolating power and they stand aloof from this world's interests. No light issues from them to solve its difficulties. When and in such measure as any of those who agree with them in belief, but who as more in contact with busy life are driven by their better nature to apply themselves to this task, endeavour to solve those difficulties, we feel that they move at a disadvantage, encumbered by the doctrines from which they profess to draw their stimulation. As far as it is real service they give it is the service of the ordinary citizen, the theologian disappears, or so far as he remains he invests his action with a sense of incongruity, obvious both to himself and the beholder.

If we turn to Humanity all is otherwise. The light she gives is hardly questioned even by those who shrink from acknowledging her sway, much less by those who ignore her, whilst accepting her gifts. She wants power, she waits for

the reception which will give her power, she has come to her own and her own have not yet received her. She waits for the submission of the generation, which is for the time in trust, to the influence of the light she provides, but the beneficent effects of that light are felt before its origin is acknowledged. Allowing for this want we cannot doubt, we may so easily verify the fact, that as each question presents itself for an answer, the more we turn to Humanity, the more purely human our method of examination and treatment, the more it becomes clear to us. Try the whole round of questions, personal, political, social, industrial, or moral, and you will find that in all, to take your stand on her existence, and deduce your guidance from her, is at once to clear up confusion, and introduce simplicity and order. Men feel that it is so, and hence the variety in their judgments of her disciples. Those who dislike the new order which those disciples seek to introduce, hesitate not. The disciples of Humanity are to such collectively the most pernicious of all contemporary influences. Those, on the other hand, who are engaged in remedying the evils of the old order, hold a different language. Without theoretic agreement, they accept and invite the aid Positivism can give, they acknowledge the general correctness of its judgments, the beauty of the motives it inculcates, in their special object they welcome its co-operation. They may disagree with, but they are not unfriendly to its believers. But in both cases there is a recognition of the power for guidance inherent in the new doctrine. Humanity is seen to be a well-spring of clearness as of union. I would not claim more than is her due, but I may not claim less. There is ample ground for our distrust of ourselves as her disciples; our shortcomings hitherto warrant no self-assertion; but our confidence in her should override our distrust of ourselves, and in due measure translate it into a tempered, but just self-reliance.

It is in the spirit of such just self-reliance that we confront the problems that lie before us, the difficult task which has devolved upon us, the difficult task, especially for us of the first generation, of living our faith, and interpreting it to others by our life and thought. It is the task of each generation in turn, and there is sufficient aid given each for

its performance. With each, in fact, the aid increases. We enter into the labour of others, the contribution of their insight and their loving service. The power we adore is ever stirring up the fresh results of successive exertion. She is lovingly providing for the welfare of the unborn, whilst more securely guiding the living.

The conclusion of the whole matter is simple. Love begets light, and light ministers to love, and the harmonious combination of the two constitutes life. So Humanity, as the source of life and love and light, passes on to an ever fuller completion of her being, determined by her Past, determining her Future, disciplining and guiding her Present. Ever growing and developing greater power, she, the common Mother, has in succession sympathised with her children's existence in all its vicissitudes. She has stood by the cross of her sons as the sorrowing Mother—*Mater dolorosa*—her soul pierced by their suffering as by a sword. She has been with them in the hour of their occasional victory over suffering. She has aided and rejoiced in their triumphs. As the ages roll onwards to greater brightness, she becomes more and more the undimmed object of their adoration as the Queen of Earth—all glorious within—*Mater gloriosa*.

'O Virgin Mother, daughter of thy Son!' &c.

DANTE: *Par.* xxxiii., 1-22. See p. 519.

THE ANNUAL ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE

CHURCH OF HUMANITY, 19 Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C.,

On the Festival of Humanity 103 (1 January, 1891).

*THE RECOGNITION OF HUMANITY.**

We have expressed our feelings of goodwill towards all those who are associated with us in the belief and proclamation of the Religion of Humanity; all the religious disciples, whether in groups or under the harder condition of standing alone, are present to our thought. We may now remember, as on each recurrence of this festival, that they think of us, that we and they form one body by a common faith, a body of which each part on this day is more immediately in connection with the whole. From some I have the commission to offer you their greetings—Calcutta, Liverpool, Newcastle, from Dr. Lagarrigue in Paris—and I am certain that, without this commission, I may say the same of the rest. We should not forget, moreover, that there are some absent to-day who for many years have been present at this festival. We are sensible of their absence, whilst we count on their being with us in spirit. It is this spiritual communion, felt by many even who are not with us or felt only in a looser general sense, but felt by all who are heartily one with us in the Faith and Hope and Love of Humanity—it is this spiritual communion which should invest this and similar meetings with their true character. So that under it we pass beyond narrow limits and small numbers into the presence of the much larger existing whole which is here represented, summoning also all those who have passed away from us, as well as all the generations of future believers, the generation which will look back with indulgent affection on us who have preceded them, and in the measure of our ability have been instrumental in handing down to them the heritage which we received.

* The commemorative form given on pages 567, 568 applies also to this address.

And now, what have I to say. I have to review, as usual, very generally the past year and the state in which it leaves us politically. Politically, that is, in the wider acceptance of the term, referring it to the relations of the organs of Humanity, not to our own national domestic politics : without, however, returning on the larger international interests treated last year. Next I have to touch on some social questions discussed during the year ; after which, something said on our own movement, I pass to my main subject, which never can this day be limited to any partial aspect of human affairs, but must embrace the whole of Humanity, its two constituents in closest union, the Past and the Future.

The calm which our belief naturally brings to its disciples in exact proportion as it colours their thoughts and lives, enables us to watch with interest at once and with patience the events which the years as they pass offer to our view. It enables us also to distinguish their relative importance, as well as to see how very transient is the importance of most of them ; perhaps more particularly of those which force themselves most on the attention. We are led by the whole tenour of our religious conceptions to seek to penetrate below the surface, and to follow the 'main currents which draw the years' rather than the more superficial ones. To be precise, this would mean that we track with more care the social than the political movements, the religious with more care than the social. It is the more difficult course, but if followed, it repays us better both for clearness of judgment and strength of purpose. It is more thoroughly in keeping with our general position and the nature of the task we have undertaken—the task of reorganising society from within.

And the march of events is such often as to lead us of itself to this course. It has been such during the past year, which has not been marked by any very striking event. The year has had its interest. In this busy and restless state, what year could fail so far ? But a review of it leaves a general impression of indifference to any outward occurrences, a limitation of our curiosity to their inner significance.

In Europe generally the uncertainty and uneasiness which have prevailed so long still prevail. The state of things is still, as it has been so long, an armed peace. What is visible

is the preparation for war. What we hear is assurances of peace—officially at least. But that these assurances inspire little confidence is evident from the language which at intervals escapes statesmen who are not of the actual official circle. So unstable is the condition of things, that the one security for peace seems to lie in the greatness of the risk to be incurred by war, its costliness in lives and money. Still war is as yet averted, and each year of peace is a gain, were it only that it gives additional time for opinion to tell,—the opinion of the more impartial observers, which is strongly in favour of peace. It may be hoped that there is sufficient force in this opinion to direct the attention of the statesmen of the European powers to such action as may diminish the danger. In their language they bow to the dominant tone. It remains for them to bring their conduct into accordance with their language by a persevering insistence on a peaceful policy ; and a peaceful policy really means a policy of prevision tending to remove as far as is possible the sources of danger.

You all know what those sources are, as commonly estimated. In Eastern Europe Russia, in Western Europe the relations between France and Germany, with Russia again in the background. It is in the combination of the two sources that we see their gravity. Were Russia thoroughly peaceful there would be less immediate strain. And so much may be said, that Russia, less than any other European power, is under any strong natural temptation to be other than peaceful. Her position is such that she is safe from all aggression. Had she no aggressive tendencies, none of the other powers concerned would think of attacking her, and no Western power could look to her for help. On her, therefore, rests a greater responsibility if, whilst safe by her position, she seek to encroach on others.

Between France and England there has been, and is, a strain due to our retaining our hold on Egypt. This raises the question : what is really the advantage to Egypt of our retaining that hold—advantage, I mean, to the Egyptian population ? There is loud assertion of the value of our Government. Is it really desirable ? After all it is an alien rule and calculated to check all native impulse. On any

really unselfish judgment we may well urge the withdrawal of England from Egypt in the interest of the population we claim to serve, a withdrawal to be effected in careful concert with France.

Other African complications are in no degree diminished. As one difficulty seems to disappear another replaces it. The grasp of collective Europe tightens on that unhappy country, and with it are multiplied the risks of collision between the European states.

To sum up, there is tension within the Western portion of Europe, and tension implies danger; and there are jealousies due to external considerations, to Egypt, to Africa, and to competition in encroachments elsewhere. But the danger really lies in the negative state, in the absence of any common purpose, in the consequent undue importance given to each nation's self-interest. Broken up as the West is, with no central unity, with no common action, and massed in large units which remain separate units, there is always imminence of conflict. And this dangerous condition is the inevitable result of an absence of a common faith. Were such a faith accepted, it would be a bond of union and indicate the right direction of external activity, the higher mutual duties which follow on the common submission to Humanity.

On the surface it would appear that the spirit against which, by our Faith, we are in constant protest—the spirit of Imperialism—is in the ascendant and advancing. Here, as in other countries, appeals to the pride of Empire are very frequent, the occasion for them in England being always at hand in consequence of the prominence taken by or given to the Irish question, the first and most important test of Imperialism. Aroused by Ireland, the spirit enlarges its field and includes the whole of our existing possessions and our possible acquisitions. We must recognise facts, and if the spirit is dominant we can only increase our steady opposition to it. But in such a state of opinion as we see around us it is extremely difficult to say what is dominant. And there are not wanting signs that appearances here as elsewhere are untrustworthy; that there is at any rate a very strong counter-current of opinion, the opinion of those who are hostile, not merely to the increase of our national

responsibilities, but to the perpetuation of them in their present extent. We may well doubt the supremacy so confidently at times claimed for the sentiment which clings to Empire. The more speaking and writing classes may on this, as so often in our own experience, be going one way whilst the nation is in reality steadily moving another—another more in accord with its real wants and its better feelings.

The trouble of the European West—its international disorder—is seen then to be due to the ill-directed energies of its national constituents; to the persistent absorption in its own selfish interests of each separate nation; to the neglect or postponement of the higher considerations connected with the whole they together constitute; and it is aided and intensified by influences outside of that whole. But the evil stops not here. It is not confined to the European West. It propagates itself, and injures the other portion of the Western world—the newer States which have been formed by its colonial enterprise. Notably is this the case in the South American Republics. In the difficulties which attend on their evolution the settlements of the Latin division of Europe would find their way easier had they a sounder influence brought to bear on them, not so much from their own more immediate parent states as from the real head of the Latin race—France. For it is to France they look more especially for the present, as in form at least her government resembles theirs, her Republican experience uniting her with them. We must wait for fuller knowledge of the actual facts before we can form a correct opinion on the Chilian and Brazilian crises or revolutions. But we may well feel that the course of those revolutions would be most beneficially affected were there a true guidance to be found in France, could her example have been in favour of a more concentrated government—not as it is at present, in favour of the parliamentary form. It is a matter for grave doubt whether countries constituted as Chili and Brazil are by their previous history, the character of their population, and the discord in point of belief, are really adapted for this peculiar form, which even in Europe has no deep hold except on our own country. There is good ground for preferring to it the

dictatorial form. Only the distinction must not be overlooked between a dictatorship of reaction and a dictatorship of progress. And whatever may have been the case in Chili, I infer that the latest change in Brazil has been welcomed by our co-religionists there on the ground of this distinction, that though the last crisis has set aside the dictatorship as instituted on the fall of the Empire, that has been a gain, because the power placed in the hand of the military dictator was being used in a highly retrograde spirit, to the entire suppression of all liberty of speech or publication, the respect for which is the indispensable condition attaching to the Positive conception of the Dictatorship.

Within the more confined range of questions that concern our own country, a brief notice is required of the trouble in India during the year—one of the troubles, I ought perhaps to say. The elements of danger, special and general, are so numerous already there, that the creation of a fresh one, unless under an imperious necessity, would seem to be most undesirable. Yet from all that appears this has been done in the case of Manipur. There has been shown no necessity for intervention in the affairs of that small independent State. The restless desire for unchecked power, the evil instinct of domination—these, in opposition to the dictates of true statesmanship, suggested a semi-treacherous aggression, which led to violence and its repression with the usual consequence of a most questionable after-vengeance. And the final issue is a haughty assertion of complete dominion, which leaves the Manipur State only the semblance of independence, and is calculated by its tone to spread in other directions dislike and distrust. It is true there has been no annexation, but the abstention was hardly due to the Anglo-Indian Government. It was the result rather of the expression of English opinion, which (it is a pleasure to record it) has been throughout unfavourable to the action of the Calcutta administration, and has condemned alike its ends and its means. But for its misdoing in this case, as for previous misdoings—for example, in Burmah as the most glaring recent instance—there will be no adequate punishment. It is something gained if it be not made the ground for a most discreditable increase of honour.

Did my limits allow I would speak on the connection of India and China through the Opium question, which is again attracting some of the attention it deserves, as also on the difficulties which beset China from the Missionaries and the European nations which feel called on to protect them.

For Ireland, we are in a period of expectancy, waiting to see in what the new grouping of forces consequent on the loss of a real leader may end in that country. In substance, all remains unchanged, the demand on England's justice and wisdom remains the same, the accumulation of difficulties undiminished, the immediate arrangements and the ultimate settlement still in great uncertainty. On no point, moreover, is it more difficult to gauge the opinion of the stronger nation—a problem which has of late received a new complication. But if there is reason to look on the whole subject as being essentially where it was, without judging minor and temporary modifications or alleviations, some of which have given proof of a wise vigour, then now as heretofore we may rest in the conviction that for a long time yet Ireland will tax the energy and clog the action of our statesmen. There, as elsewhere, the supreme hope lies in a change in the moral judgment of the English nation, such as shall lead it to recognise the just claims of others and its own duties, to the exclusion of all motives traceable to national pride or imperial ambition—such as shall lead it to act in dutiful submission to Humanity. To that all comes ultimately. In the meantime we may remark that as we advance farther and farther into the revolutionary condition, which is and has been for some time upon us, all these questions of outside action will be found intimately bound up with right management within; and the impression that they are so will gain strength from, and give strength to, the moral change which I have invoked. If at times we press for more immediate action than others think desirable on this Irish as on other similar points, it is partly at any rate from the conviction that the existing state tends to misdirect our efforts and to divert our energies from their true sphere, at the same time that whilst maintained it perverts our moral judgments; that in a word it is maintained in the interest of a very defective political order and to the deterioration of our national conscience.

There is in fact a common element which gives their importance to the political disorders which I have mentioned, namely, that they interfere with the healthy evolution of human society under a peaceful and orderly direction, that they hamper the greater alterations which are waiting their accomplishment. For there can be no doubt about it, all who think at all feel that we are on the eve of great changes, feel that the gradual progress of events has already brought us into the orbit, as it were, of such changes, that in a word the existing state of things is merely transitional, working to the loosening of the old, the slow ingrafting of the new. One sign of this is the prevalence of Utopias, slight and unsatisfactory enough in most cases, yet giving evidence of the above-stated conviction. Another sign is the clutching, under the sense of an insecure footing, at all kinds of proffered remedies—various faiths, old and new, indigenous or brought from far. The one of most interest, the one which I should expect to prove of the most power and consequence, is the call back to the Past, the call to lean again on the older stays, to return to the Religion of our Western Past—Roman Catholic or Protestant. In its way this is an acknowledgment of our conclusion here, that in religion, in a religious change, lies the whole question, that every other movement is dependent on this inner one. So far it is useful—otherwise we are quite clear on the point. Back to the Past we cannot go. We use it, profit by it, reverence it, but we are not of it. We hear the call, but disregard it.

Apart, however, from this there are certain movements which may be taken by themselves for our examination. They are only to be carried forward to their final goal by the religious change, but they may advance pending the arrival of that, as they have been advancing for generations past. I can but treat them summarily and under a particular aspect.

The past has left us three social questions, to which I would direct attention, because one of them has been very prominent throughout the year. It has been a year more than most marked by industrial strife and discussion, by the prevalence and persistence of the labour struggle. And I would link the other questions to this, treat of them

principally as they are related to this of labour. We may deprecate some of the incidents of this labour warfare, but as a whole we here welcome, even under any temporary disadvantages, the serious examination of the conditions of labour, and everything which enforces such examination. For our religion accepts as a legacy from the whole of the Past the obligation of settling this capital problem: What is the proper social position—what the true function of the proletariat, the working classes? We trace, therefore, with interest through history the steps taken towards such final settlement. We seek, by a right interpretation of their connection and general bearing, to get a clear insight into the direction taken, a clear perception of the ultimate issue. We seek, apart from details and occasional complications, to judge the tendency of the phase through which we are now passing. It is the main current, the final result, with which we are now concerned. So examined, the present aspect of things is of a satisfactory character. We seem to be nearer the end, more in sight of the goal than we have been. All points to the approaching recognition of the claim of the industrial workers to their admission to full citizenship; not to mere voting power, but to the participation in all the benefits which by their ceaseless toil throughout the generations have become accessible to man; benefits which have long been the portion of the few, have gradually been shared by more, are in these times and the times immediately following to become the portion of all.

The particular points raised, the special method, I repeat it, we may leave. As a rule we as Positivists do not look to legislation as our great resource; our principle that industry should be moralised takes it out of the sphere of legislation. It rather means a complete reorganisation under a new impulse. We examine, therefore, the essence of the demands made more than their actual form; though the form may have great use as distinctly stating a want.

The want is that the exclusive consideration of production be abandoned, that the industrial worker cease to be regarded even primarily as a mere producer, much less must he be so regarded exclusively. And it is to this change that the actual form of industrial conflicts is pointing more and more.

I need not shrink from repetition of what has been said here, from saying again that under this Eight Hours demand, which may hardly be attained by Legislation, there is sought by the workers a change in their whole position; that throughout all their efforts, underlying them all, permeating them all, there is, more or less dimly seen, often confusedly presented, the conception of a new social existence for themselves. So it is; for the future it is the man and the citizen that is to be considered before the worker, the agent of production before the production. The conditions of human labour have to be adapted to this new end. This more than others we recognise as the true end, and our whole industrial conceptions are qualified by it. Here it suffices if I indicate one. We are strongly favourable to capital, in no way share the feeling so general that it ought to be broken into small portions and widely distributed. And one reason for this our attitude is that we wish capital enabled by its concentration in large masses to meet the new demand, to be able to secure for those who by their labour give capital life and utility a stability and permanence in their existence, which are at present unknown. On such large questions it is clear that I can only now speak shortly and generally, calling attention to tendencies, not working out the details. The last few months have witnessed a singular advance on the point immediately before us, giving very much greater importance to a question which has been forcing itself forward for some years. It has at length assumed its just position, and the leading public men of the day are busied with it. I allude to the so-called rural labour—the condition of the agricultural labourer. The issue raised is how is he to be so attached to the land that he may be satisfied with his state; his dissatisfaction being tested by his leaving it. Economic forces, political development, social arrangements, all concur in giving weight to this long-standing, but also long-neglected problem. Again I only wish in the most general way to indicate tendencies, and these evidently are towards the giving the labourer a share in two at any rate of the most valuable benefits of social order, the giving him a fixed home of his own, and the giving him property—landed property—a freehold tenure of

some portion of the soil which he tills. A small portion it may be, but still his own freehold. These granted he becomes in a very different degree from what he has hitherto been, a citizen, a real member of our social organisation. If such benefits extend to him from the towns in the first instance, in return the principle will come back from him to the organised labour of the towns, and though land is out of the question in the ordinary sense, the possession in full property of the domicile will be asserted and established for the town labouring population. I do not for a moment think that these unquestioned improvements are all that is required—other and deeper changes are necessary—but those mentioned suffice for my present purpose, and have in them a reserve of power for further advance.

A second legacy of the Past regards the position of women, a point so much debated and debated with considerable heat and confusion. From the discussions we shall do well to keep as clear as we can. But there is little doubt that under them all the real issue, that of placing the relations of the two sexes on their true footing, is advancing to its settlement. There is often undue irritation. There is not sufficient allowance for the complex constitution of Humanity, and for the consequent slowness of her march; there is, so far as I can see, an inadequate acknowledgment of what has been done, an excessive insistence on what has been left undone, and as a result the arousal of a spirit of rivalry, of jealousy, where such feelings should have no place. There is, therefore, much needed a new spirit in the conduct of the discussion if it must proceed. Rather, however, there is needed the conviction that, allowing for exceptional circumstances, peculiarities in this or that population, the two sexes have a common purpose, for the attainment of which the collaboration of both is quite indispensable, towards which both contribute equally though differently, without there being any proper opening for antagonism or rivalry. Contenting myself with this very general statement, I would for my purpose to-day bring this question into connection with the previous subject, that of the organisation of labour. In the material sphere, the sphere of industry, again under the same reserve as above, allowing that is for exceptional

circumstances, themselves highly susceptible of change, both sexes have their place, each its proper function—that of production devolving on the man, that of conservation of material capital—a scarcely less important contribution to the wealth of the society—devolving upon woman.

Be this as it may, we can see in the importance attaching to the whole subject the determination to sift the matter to the uttermost, and the desire to come to a right conclusion—which is historically a revival of the medieval conclusion enlarged to suit the requirements of modern life. Farther, and again in connection with our previous remarks, who can doubt but that, the proletariat once duly organised, possessed of homes in the true sense, and with fixity of conditions of labour, consequently with the opportunity for family life, the enormous majority of the nation or nations will have in the constitution of the family the soundest guide to a right conclusion on the subject of the sexes; and that as wife, mother, and daughter, women will find the difficulties at present raised gradually disappear. The general control or check instituted by such an organisation of the proletariat, that body—the general providence of Humanity, as it is termed in our social worship—will spread the order which it finds sufficient for itself to the other portions of the common society. It is this broader national or proletariat view which has to enter into all our calculations on these subjects. So that the two undercurrents unite their strength and move to a completely identical conclusion. The full citizenship of the workers, whether in town or country, being granted as the object to pursue, its attainment is evidently impossible without security for the family life in an equal degree with the security already reached by the classes which have long had such citizenship, and had a monopoly of it. And with security in due measure for the family life, the labour of women outside their homes will recede more and more from daily practical life and become one of the sadder reminiscences of a lower civilisation.

Closely allied to the two subjects which I have been treating, is another which takes the shape of a question: How, by what instrumentality, is the position of the industrial, workers, as also the position of women, to be established in

consonance with the above indications? The answer is for us that it will by the constitution of a priesthood.

If on the first view there is much which is unpropitious to the avowed aim; if there is above all the deep-seated Protestant and revolutionary aversion to a priesthood of any kind, so that the name is odious to most—yet, here again, if we study with care the facts of our present order we find that there is much which makes the other way. The great religious bodies, Catholic or Protestant, are not animated by this aversion. The Catholic never has been so. Its theory is entirely bound up with a priestly power. The Protestant bodies are more alien in word than in reality. In our own time a great change has been effected in this respect in that which for us is the most important of all the Protestant organisations—the Episcopal Church of England. In it the hostility to the priestly name has been greatly lessened. And essentially through all the churches the ministerial office has been in a degree rising in importance in the eyes of those among whom it is exercised. But for my purpose it is well to direct our eyes elsewhere, on the sphere of thought and action which is outside the religious or theological world, and examine how the matter stands there.

In the extreme weight attached to ordinary scientific opinion, in the bowing down before science as it is called without question, we have in principle the acceptance of a guidance, as opposed to the assertion of individual judgment, in the name of which a priesthood is so disliked. So it is with the deference to the press, the newspaper press, or other periodical form—with the reliance on it, at any rate, in default of any avowed deference. It is the practical acceptance of a guidance. But more important in connection with what I have been saying is the observation of what is going on in the department of labour. Commissions of enquiry, councils of delegates, conferences of employers and employed, arbitration, industrial conciliation, these and similar terms all point one way—to the desirability of, and to the desire for, some intermediate agency between the parties actually in strong opposition, and between whom a certain antagonism will always exist. In some cases, and with more or less success, there has been

the intervention of men not immediately connected with industry, who might therefore as such be considered impartial. In an imperfect form their intervention is an anticipation of the regular action of a purely human Priesthood, the organ of a demonstrable religion. Disencumbered of all theological motives or sanctions, not swayed by the interests of a tottering belief or of a certain church organisation, not bound to the social order of the past, or influenced by the feelings of class distinctions, but speaking in the name of a strictly scientific conclusion, as the voice of the common interest of society, deriving their commission and their weight from their recognised public service as teachers of both the parties concerned during their passage from childhood to manhood, themselves possessing no wealth, and so materially disinterested, the priests of Humanity will be well qualified for their function as permanent mediators in the rare contests which even a better organisation of industry will see, and will find ample employment in the difficult times which industry, struggling towards organisation, must inevitably go through. Their interposition if so qualified will be more and more invoked.

Again, in closest connection with all I have been saying is the subject of elementary instruction, which has been of late a cause of irritation. It naturally enters into this review of the year, and it may introduce wider considerations. Throughout, whilst regretting it, we Positivists have recognised the necessity of some such system as that which has been in force for twenty-one years. We wish as much as any that elementary instruction, and much more than can come under the term, be within the reach of and attained by all children, so that they may be ready for the higher instruction of later years, and we see that if it is to be given it cannot, under the present conditions of industrial life, be given by the family. We see that the society must for a time replace the family. So far we assent to the interference of the State. But our aim would be to make this interference as temporary, as provisional, as avowedly as possible a preparation for a better system. Therefore we should act consistently against all extension of the interference beyond the most necessary limits, beyond what may

fairly be called simple elementary instruction. Access to this we would open to all, but without compulsion. Compulsion withdrawn, it need not be necessarily gratuitous. Whether gratuitous or not it must be given at a great cost, and in the application of public money there should in this, as in all other departments, be the sternest economy, for the burden of social needs is heavy. There should be such appeal as may be wise to the efforts of the family, so to keep before it its ultimate duty which it is unable to discharge at present.

Whilst then we accept, so limited, the intervention of the State, we deprecate most resolutely its rising claim to bring within its grasp the whole of the teaching department. And as supporting that claim we deprecate the increase of subventions to various so-called educational bodies, colleges, or societies, or universities, whatever their name — bodies engaged in the imparting of instruction. Let them depend on themselves and on the classes to which they more immediately appeal, not come to the State and the public funds for their material support. Each year sees more encroachment on their part, more weakness in giving on the part of government. The gift is not disinterested after all; it implies concession on the part of those who take it, and the concession is a weakened and vitiated teaching tending to maintenance of the existing order and beliefs. This by the way. On instruction generally much thought is being directed, and the result can hardly be acquiescence in the actual condition. If we relegate it to its proper station and turn to the larger question of education, then we once more see how the previous subjects are bound up with it. For the secure and wise organisation of the proletary family will discard the intrusive system which has been accepted for a time, cause the family to resume its inherent attribute as alone competent to educate, and teach it to look for such instruction as is beyond its competence to the teachings of the priesthood—all the incidental discussions that obscure and embitter the question dying out of themselves.

In all three of these allied subjects I have had one aim, to indicate that underneath all our disputes about them the current is setting in favour of a final and satisfactory settle-

ment ; a settlement in conformity with the efforts of the past, in conformity with the legitimate anticipations of the future ; the results already attained guaranteeing the attainment of what is wanting to complete them. And all that I have said points to the existence of a power able to direct the current aright, to secure a correspondence of achievement to desire.

From this review of social questions under discussion I pass to ourselves. For us, who work on in the work of spreading the new religion, we work in expectation and in hope mainly, but yet not without the consciousness that it is not all expectation and hope. We know that if much remains to be done, something has been done, that we are not without a foretaste of the better reality. However on ourselves and on our fellow-workers, I have now but little to say. I would merely sum up what has been said here during the past year, that the quiet period in which we are, is not one of inaction, nor without its value ; that it affords us scope for our profiting, for our strengthening ourselves for endurance in action, in the faith and discipline of the new religion, that it is not unmarked by energy in the propagating them. There are evidences of initiative which are encouraging. We cannot do much in our present circumstances, but we should welcome any offer of additional activity. Our strength must at present lie in persistence in the unity of presentation which characterises our teaching in this place. Secondly, that if we seem stationary we are not so in reality, and that outside us it is far from being so, that the human doctrine is making its way, is felt and acknowledged as a power. Each year can bring no very sensible change, but as the years accrue the sum of their efforts issues in a great change. Outwardly we remain the same, the course we pursue unchanged, the aspect of the room unaltered, with one addition, however, the tablet which has reached us from Liverpool, as the gift of Dr. Carson's widow. Connected as both were with this room by the renewal here of their marriage, I assented at once to her wish that this memorial might find a place here. It is also valuable as an evidence of the substantial union of the two bodies.

On the method of our propaganda it may be useful to repeat that it should be mainly oral. To digest ourselves first what we have to offer to others, then to give it out fresh

from our own mind's effort, that is the way which all experience seems to sanction. It can only be on our own interest, on our impulse to carry to others that which we have found precious, that we can usefully rely. Not on books; books are for those who have accepted the religion and wish to gain more knowledge and insight into what they have accepted. The details of the system and its doctrine, when we want these we may go to books and strengthen our hold on the whole by mastering them, but it is the whole itself and its promise and power that we must trust to for attraction. It is Humanity that we have to proclaim in Her unity, it is Her power to take a place really vacant, Her accession as heir to all the religious accumulations of our forefathers, on which we have to insist. Very simple is the first appeal we have to make, the course of events is daily adding force to it.

It has been my wish and endeavour in all I have said, to leave a feeling that whatever the particular subject dealt with, there underlay it a reference to Humanity as the final arbiter in all. Such is the position She has taken.

For this is our natural point of departure to-day, looking back on former utterances. As I said at the beginning, on these occasions we can rest in no partial considerations, all-prevailing should be the pressure of Humanity's presence, driving out and overruling all jars, all reminiscences of discord. She should come before us therefore in Her fulness, under Her aspect as triumphant. As such we are more concerned with the anticipations of Her future than with the records of Her conflicts, though never losing the complete unity of the two portions of Her continuous existence. Such anticipations are amply warranted. For all our thought is but the use of our reason to guide our action, and action is concerned with the future as it falls through the passing hour to become the past. We have on former occasions made clear to ourselves that the power of Humanity is real and great, that Her will has been through all vicissitudes undeviating, put into execution by each generation in succession as it accomplishes its special task, that Her love is unquestionable, love being Her essential, inseparable characteristic as the common Mother of all Her children. There remains only that Her children now that she has come to them, should receive Her

and aid Her to fulfil Her mission, to complete Her being. To this should tend all our meditation on the life of Humanity; our meditation on Her upward course, Her period of trial and suffering as of latency being only used to strengthen us in smoothing the passage from Her imperfect to Her perfect recognition.

There is a large amount of this imperfect recognition, a large and increasing amount of Her spontaneous worship, in a very true if very insufficient sense addressing itself to Her directly. Still more of it is there if we look to the indirect tendency of the religion around us, the theological teaching and action of the present day. The believers in theology cling to the past form of their service; they cling to the human creations which have been a guidance in the past. They still serve the representatives of Humanity, serve Her therefore under a veil. But the veil is becoming more transparent. In other words, there is being imported into their service more and more of the Human—in all ways; most notably and most usefully in this way, that they seek to justify their particular form of service by greater insistence on this one point: that it is the form most in accordance with the true wants of mankind, both material and moral. Under the growing power of the human idea they are driven to meet us on our own ground, to stake their existence as we do on the simple issue, which of the two can guide earth's destinies best. And that is the real issue, which most of the discussion I see ignores or leaves in the background. All else is irrelevant. And there is no other way of deciding such an issue but by experience. The comforting point is that by the very statement of it we see that both the contending parties have a common object, the welfare of those whose direction they would each monopolise.

It is for the children and servants of Humanity to change this spontaneous worship and service, whether direct or indirect, into an intelligent and well-guided worship and service. What we have to do towards this end is very much what our predecessors had to do in their day. The Christ of the Past, the Christ of the future, both are gradual constructions, requiring time for their completer expression—never reaching their completion. That the first was gradual

we may easily see. Contrast the simple outline of the type as we find it in St. Paul with the fulness of presentation which it has gained during the centuries of the Christian Church's existence. No details of the personal life are given by the Apostle. He preaches the Christ crucified, declared to be the Son of God by His resurrection, the Second Adam in whom all are made alive. It was for after times to read into this outline all that we were taught to associate with it, to draw out the more human elements in it, and adapt it to the varying wants of the successive generations. I do but indicate the leading idea of the comparison.

Owing to its greater reality, the construction of the social Christ is at this early stage of our course far more advanced. It was necessary that it should be so, as it could not be revealed to man otherwise than on the strength of past facts. Hence we have less to do in working out the conception—our main labour is to imprint it on ourselves.

But we have to build up as a practical power the Humanity we proclaim, to draw out all the force of the conception. We are richly equipped for this task. There stands the life before us in its unity and in its diversity as embodied in its collective and individual organs. We have to meditate upon it and make it our own by meditation, and by the imitation in which for us, as for our forefathers, meditation should issue. As their imitation took a personal character, answering to the type imitated—so personal a character as to be repellent occasionally to all, to some not merely occasionally—so ours must take a social character, as the type is social and collective.

The object is to construct with an ever-increasing completeness the shelter which man needs, to strengthen the mediatorial action of Humanity. We see that of Herself She has constantly advanced in this direction, that the protecting power of human society has been gradually growing stronger. It remains imperfect enough, but the advance made is every day becoming more incontestable as the comparison of civilised with uncivilised man is more elaborated. We know also that, unaided and by Her own impulse, She will keep on in the same direction which She has followed without external aid hitherto. The point to

consider is whether, with the conscious help of Her children, Her progress may not be much quickened to their advantage and the advantage of those who follow them. Undoubtedly it may. To give this conscious aid is the duty of all who have been awakened to the consciousness, and as the impulse to perform this duty is derivable from both the Future and the Past, so the light by which we can perform it rightly is given by the Past.

Very rich in instruction is the life on which we meditate. Begun in weakness and dispersion and conflict, we see a gradual concentration of its forces lessening the collision by extending the limits within which conflict was suppressed, and awakening a community of interest on a large scale. We see the growing intercommunion of the larger bodies thus formed, and the consequent perception of the need of a community of thought. We see this perception rising into the conviction that such community of thought must take the shape of a common religion, and the aspiration after such religion constantly strengthening. Or we may take the more immediately practical aspect, and we may trace the power of Humanity to shelter within their own bounds Her several organs. We may follow Her sufferings through the imperfections of those organs within and their pretensions without; Her increasing control of the resources of the planet; the accomplished co-operation of the whole of its inhabitants for the good, for the material advantage of all its separate parts. Or again, we may look at the varied demands of man's nature and circumstances, and see how they are met by this fuller, richer life which is offered us by the collective existence of Humanity. The same follows also from the consideration of the individual organs who represent the various sides of Her collective existence. Whatever our own life may be in form, it finds in their roll an exemplar or exemplars with which we can be in sympathy, and from which we can derive encouragement. Humanity has provided us with all this. She has done it all. All that She has done has been done without any aid. It is Her own arm that has brought salvation to Her. Her creations have had no power but such as they derived from Her. They were needed for a time and suited men's wants, and under their reflected power the

dispersed portions of the human family found a partial union and the shelter they required. But no partial unions are any longer sufficient. The widening communion of thought and action demands a corresponding enlargement of the highest expression of such communion—of the religious bond of mankind. Fearlessly we throw aside all the former forms of that bond as suited only to dispersed portions, and adopt the only form which appeals to man as man—the only form which can be as universal as the race. Humanity puts away from Her all Her own creations, and takes Her seat on the vacant throne—to reign with growing power during the human future.

By Her, and in Her, and for Her, are our life and hope ;
to Her rises our prayer in the words of a long consecration :

‘ O Virgin Mother, daughter of thy Son ! ’ &c.

DANTE : *Par.* xxxiii., 1-22. See p. 519.

THE ANNUAL ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE

CHURCH OF HUMANITY, 19 Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C.,

on the Festival of Humanity 104 (1 January, 1892).

COMMEMORATION OF AUGUSTE COMTE.

For the third time we meet here to celebrate the anniversary of our Master's death. Previously it had been a matter mainly of central observance; but wherever His disciples exist in sufficient numbers, such a tribute to His memory may be looked for, and the opportunity of paying it welcomed, by them. The local, and therefore ultimately universal, discharge of this natural obligation, should become a permanent institution; and has, I hope, taken its place as such in your minds as English Positivists. With the persistence which should be our characteristic, three repetitions ought to be sufficient to ensure such permanence, especially as the meeting need not depend on this or that person. As a social act, unconnected with any sacramental conception, of a purely commemorative character, it might always be held, under the presidency of any sincere disciple who would give some simple expression to the general feeling.

I would remark that the date should be clear in our minds as the 24th Gutenberg, the day of September varying in Leap years. If we habitually think or speak of the 5th of September we are liable to confusion, and to the neglect of our own religious calendar on an occasion when it is peculiarly appropriate. With the growing habit amongst us of using that calendar, all difficulty will cease; all our associations, personal, family, and ecclesiastical, will rapidly adapt themselves to it as it becomes familiar, and the adaptation will increase our familiarity.

Subjection to the sway of the Dead, reverence for them, their cultus by ever-recurring commemoration,—such ideas are inherent in our religious system. They apply properly to the noble Dead, though we yearly direct our remembrance and our sympathy on all the dead without exception. But

it is memory and sympathy, not honour, that we then offer ; we recognise an involuntary service and their community of nature ; we owe them no gratitude for noble work ; we receive from them no great impulse. And whilst in our personal and domestic worship we have the opportunity of cherishing our personal and family memories, our own peculiar household divinities with whom our lives have been bound up, our public cultus must always be addressed to the greater Dead ; for towards such only can reverence be widely shared, from such only can a large measure of direct influence go forth. In this, as in so much else, we do but ratify and enlarge previous practice, so that we may spare any labour in vindicating that practice ; least of all need we vindicate it in the case with which we are immediately concerned. The founders of religious systems have ever been, in a special degree, the objects of commemoration ; and we, who honour all the founders of the antecedent and tributary religions, be they Eastern or Western, Fetichist, Polytheist, or Monotheist, as the authors, in their degree, of signal benefits to this or that portion of mankind, have ample warrant for concentrating in some particular act the reverence we naturally feel for the founder of the religion which will, in the end, absorb all those its predecessors, and be in act, as it is in theory, universal to mankind. Assuming that we are justified in this language, it may be well to remember that the founder is not the religion, not its central idea, that is ; that with Moses, St. Paul, and Mohammed, Auguste Comte is not the object of worship, but the revealer, the preacher, of a higher power. In so far they stand on the same footing, the diversity of the power not altering their character. Those who accept their teaching and follow them are their disciples, but are believers in that which they have proclaimed, their fellow-worshippers and their fellow-servants. In other and more direct words, we are believers in Humanity, disciples of Auguste Comte. Hence our rejection of the term Comtists, so far as it is analogous to the old term Christian, so far as it makes a person the object of our faith. From the more scientific and intellectual aspect we are Positivists ; under the more moral and religious we are, in the strictest sense, Catholics, the only justified

claimants of that noble title, which in spirit we were wise always to appropriate.

Not over-careful to avoid repetition, I may yet touch but slightly on points which I have treated on former occasions. The subject is many-sided, and will always allow for a certain variety of handling. It is so with any of the very greatest lives, to the level of which the race, as it advances, is constantly rising, and which, with each advance, receives a new significance, as is seen in regard to Aristotle and St. Paul, for instance. It is but reasonable that it should be so in a higher degree with Comte from his more complete identification with Humanity. He shares the universality of the Being he reveals. Humanity is everything to man, and as her reign extends retrospectively and prospectively when once it has been announced, takes possession, by full right, at once of the Past which has acknowledged other powers as supreme, and of the Future, in which Humanity will stand without rival, so it is, in his degree, with him who revealed her; his memory must be intimately blended with all the associations of his race, with all its aspirations. It is a peculiar, pre-eminent position, which none can share with him directly, if a certain indirect participation be accorded to some who were able to forward his work, or prepare the ground for it.

I have given above the names of the great philosopher and apostle whose work he continued and perfected. I might perhaps make my meaning clearer by another illustration, taking for it some complete and chief poet, some mighty orb of song in the fullest force of the term—Dante or Milton—with whom our continuous intellectual training brings us into constant intercourse. (I may assume so much of the members of our body.) As we traverse with the former the three realms of human existence, or with the latter see man as the central point of all spiritual influences, and with both alike are taken over the vast field of their knowledge and imagination, ranging through past, present, and such future as in poetic vision was open to them, we cannot but acknowledge the richness of the prospect opened to us, the comprehensiveness of these master-creators. Yet their possession of the domain of human interest is but

partial when compared with Comte's,—they deal, that is, with but a portion of Humanity; in her full perfection of existence she waited for a later revelation. No simplest form, no most complex development of that existence, but we are enabled by his aid to scrutinise and judge. Throughout our study of her, as throughout our service of her, his image is an inseparable part of our conception and action.

This variety, however, attaching to the subject, need not prevent our recalling briefly certain points with which we are more or less familiar,—such as the continuous intellectual labour consecrated to the service of his kind, and consequently to the special work then required; the reconstruction of its philosophical, political, social, and religious conceptions, a burden under which he never grew weary in the face of the heaviest discouragements and trials. The work done is open to us, both in an expanded and condensed form, in the volumes with which the thought of the Western world is gradually becoming impregnated; their titles I need not here recite. But in his own judgment it is incomplete, he died prematurely, leaving unachieved the final portion of the task he had set himself; the portion, that is, which he had allotted to himself in working out the whole system of the conceptions adapted to mankind in its normal state. So that his results are, in a sense, much as was accomplished, still fragmentary. The guidance he would have given we are left without, and that in the most difficult division of the whole, where knowledge issues in practice. All the accumulations of mental and moral force, which were the natural outgrowth of his previous labours, and which would have carried him with comparative ease through the work which he had planned, are thus lost to the world; and the complete harmony which its elaboration by a single mind would have given to his creation is also lost. His own language is:—‘Without this complementary work the priesthood of Humanity would find it difficult to guide the West towards the Future deduced from the Past, with the object of closing a revolution, which, as being intellectual rather than social, requires a renewal, an entire renovation of our intelligence. By putting into shape the

'leading thoughts of our regenerated descendants, there is given us a type which can alone overcome the prejudices and sophisms of our anarchical and retrograde contemporaries. Such an operation, then, it is for me to accomplish as the decisive issue of the mission assigned to my career by my earliest works, in which I placed before myself, as my aim, 'the reconstruction of the spiritual power.' We are left to realise, what he well knew would be the case, the great obstruction to the growth of the new religion constituted by this interception of his labours, by this incompleteness in the presentation of the new synthesis,—incompleteness, that is, in reference to the amount of completeness he had thought attainable by himself. Had morals and industry, the education of man and the action of man, received their due systematic expression, it is evident that the intermediate subjects, under the logical and practical influences of such expression, would have, almost of themselves, fallen into their right shape—been disciplined as logic is disciplined in the volume which we have.

And as his work remains finally a fragment, so also is it with his life. It ended prematurely, in his own judgment—which here again our experience fully confirms. His disciples, all of them incomplete, though at divers stages of incompleteness, were thrown upon their own guidance, and deprived of his powerful support and control; losing, that is, again, the large accumulation of mental and moral influence which, by the laws of our human constitution, accrete round the higher individual organs of Humanity, and when such an organ disappears, are not for a long period fully replaced, or perhaps replaceable. In this direction less had been done, comparatively speaking, than in the other. For his personal influence naturally depended, in great measure, on the construction which his works embody for us, and that had been of relatively recent achievement, most particularly so far as concerned its higher part, the religion, the one most difficult of acceptance by the general world, most alien, as he saw, to the particular world with which he was in immediate contact. In the full current of a social and religious revolution of unparalleled and increasing difficulty, it was an incalculable loss that such influence was withdrawn at so critical a point.

The formation of a great social force was but just begun, was but just gathering that impetus which would have acted with a continuous increase of pressure upon all who swelled it, when the individual organ in whom it was condensed disappeared, and, together with it, the wholesome formative power directed upon its various constituent members no less than the general action which the force would have exercised by virtue of its constitution. We, his immediate disciples, who might have felt this power in most direct action, mourn, and shall ever mourn, not merely the teacher and founder, but the master around whom we had so hesitatingly, so grudgingly rallied, but whom with added knowledge and experience we should have learnt to obey and to second.

We can afford, now that we are in the habit of meeting, to use these occasions for their direct purpose of reverence and commemoration. Still I do not feel disposed to dwell at any length on the facts of Comte's life. It may be useful to remind you that it extended from 1798 to 1857; that he died, therefore, at the age of fifty-nine. Born at Montpellier, and receiving his earliest education and instruction there, his subsequent life as a pupil and teacher was passed, with occasional official interruptions, at Paris. For the greater part of it he maintained himself partly by private tuition, partly by the income derived from appointments in connection with the Polytechnic School. When deprived of these in consequence of his opinions, he threw himself on the voluntary contributions of his disciples, confronting a precarious existence not without real danger. Under these conditions his works were written. His great discovery dates from the year 1822. His philosophy was completed in 1842. His politics in 1855. His last volume was in 1856. His principal effort coincided therefore with the time of his distress in point of money. If I add that he made a most unhappy marriage which tortured him till his wife left him in 1842; that for one year he was supremely happy in his intimacy with Madame Clotilde de Vaux; that on her death he lived in daily communion with her, being watched over with the most devoted attention and affection by the servant whom he adopted as his daughter; I have given that outline of fact which may render subsequent statements

ntelligible. It is, you will see, in one sense, an uneventful life. Those who appreciate its work, its spirit, its conditions, and the character of him who lived it, will judge it otherwise. In the absence of any adequate biography—another loss we have sustained by his death, for he contemplated an autobiography—we have many unquestioned sources from which we may draw a satisfactory representation. His letters, of which we have now two volumes published, his prefaces, and his annual circulars, are of themselves a very considerable contribution, checking all other statements, and leaving us in possession of a very definite outline of his course. For this, and for their value in other respects, particularly as so often introducing the reader easily to difficult subjects, enabling him to watch the growth of conceptions which he has seen previously in their mature form, I recommend you to them. And if the process is thus made, in some measure, harder, as being longer, and you are thrown on your own efforts instead of referred to an easy and well-written life, yet there will be a compensation, as regards your proper object, in the firmer hold you will find you will thus get of the subject, and there will be indirect compensations in the knowledge you will gain of the system itself, of the way in which its author viewed it, of the course which he anticipated for his religion, and of the methods by which he judged it would be best propagated. The circulars, I may mention, are all to be found in Dr. Robinet's notice of his life and work, in their order. But with all this, it is true, there will remain facts of his existence on which fuller light can only come when a complete publication takes place of such documents as he wished to be published, which cannot be at present; but most of the larger and more important facts relating to it are accessible in the way I have indicated. Nay, had we not such aids, had we been left to the works themselves, we should have before us, in those very works, the most prominent features of that existence. For they form the stages of the successive construction which occupied his life, and to which all else is in a way subsidiary. Had they reached us without note or comment, they would have necessitated the inference, which is the true one—the one which agrees with the facts,

I mean,—that whilst they were being written they constituted the great characteristic of the writer's existence. He must have been a great abstract thinker with his energies concentrated on his works, a theorician, not a practician, a philosopher passing into the priest, but preserving the contemplative attitude, not mixing in action. If the principal works, the writings to which we especially refer when we speak of his works, were studied and compared as other analogous works are studied and compared—and as when we have the leisure and the obligation to do so we should be wise to study and compare them—we should find but little difficulty in picturing to ourselves our Master's history; but few, if any, essential gaps would be left. Add to the principal the accessory works spoken of above, and the task is made easier, the details of the picture more full, and therefore the satisfaction greater. I am speaking for, and in the main to, reverent disciples, and such will not think the time bestowed on such study thrown away, or the subject disproportionately estimated. For the needs of the present we want a solid, well-grounded appreciation of our Master's greatness to meet all the various contingencies to which, in its progress, our religion renders us liable.

The study recommended would have another use for us. It would place us, or help to place us, in the true current of the development of our religion—which was, we are already aware, very gradual, as to the particular form it has assumed. The unity of aim pervading the whole of Comte's work has been shown, and has gained a growing recognition; but such unity is in no sense inconsistent with an expansion of the conceptions originally entertained—their expansion under fresh influences; not inconsistent, again, with the infusion into a philosophical re-organisation of the higher, warmer spirit of a religious regeneration; and it is precisely this spirit that we should aim at thoroughly imbibing, so mastering, so informing ourselves with it, as to make it throw its light back on all the previous course of the construction, so that we listen, as it were, to the most mature teaching at once, not lingering over the comparatively immature. The far higher value he attached to his later conceptions would thus become apparent, as would also the

reasonings on which he grounded his preference. We should pass in effect out of the domain of mere abstract reasoning into that of the more impassioned reasoning of his last years, when his logical method was evolved into its full perfection, when all the fervour of his being was thrown into the creations of his genius ; and in the free play of an affection sanctified by the death of its object, he found the source of his highest inspirations. There was no breach of unity, but there was the growth and outburst of a nature hitherto compressed, but which had at last found its right direction. The closest scrutiny of his utterances will be rewarded by a beneficial result upon our moral being, by an increase of our sympathy with the religious frame of mind which prompted them, as well as by a larger and more profitable comprehension of the philosophical and social system which found its culminating point in the religion for which it had throughout been the unconscious preparation, into which, in the fulness of time, it was consciously and legitimately developed.

Whilst we keep clear of any notion of belief in Auguste Comte in the ordinary sense, of any notion, in other words, of his being an object of worship in a sense different from that in which we honour other great benefactors of mankind, of any notion that is of Divine honours, it were yet well if we sought to quicken our personal feelings towards him, as the greatest of those benefactors. We need not seek, with this object, to exaggerate his greatness or to ascribe an ideal superhuman perfection to him. With him, as with others, we may subtract such imperfections as will inhere in any human type ; or we may, after the most sober estimate has been formed, let the pre-eminent services he has rendered, in addition to the essential greatness of his character and of his heart, efface any counteracting impressions, and form a whole on which we love to dwell, so that with him, as the highest individual organ of Humanity, we may delight in bringing ourselves into communion. There is a truth in the observation that the disciples of a religion are bound more closely together, have their zeal kindled and their action harmonised, by a common relation to some one great teacher, by a personal tie, that is, over and above their community of conviction. The example of Moses and Mohammed may be

appealed to on this head, and the daily practice of the Roman Catholic Church, in strict accordance with its long experience of the medieval period, lends the position additional strength. For us individually, the institution of guardian angels acknowledges that Humanity is wisely brought home to our daily thoughts by more concrete impersonations. For the universal body of our worshippers, their common acknowledgment, their common reverence for the founder of her worship, may be a source of strength in the present, as it will, I believe, be found to be, and that with a constant increase of momentum, throughout the future. It is but a just honour that we should be paying.

Whatever our conclusion as to this personal point, on which I have naturally touched, as it is my wish to give to-day's ceremony as personal a character as possible, to make it speak directly and fully of Auguste Comte, it is clear, to go back to the study of his works, that we want it in the form above recommended for our own immediate action. We have to build on his foundations, in the absence of the fuller directions he meant to have left us in his writings, or given us in person, had his life been prolonged. In such default, it is our first duty to examine well what he has done, where he left off, what hints may be gathered in one quarter or another which may enable us to work in accordance with his ideas. We have no foolish disposition to begin a new work of our own; our aim is to carry out the original conception to its legitimate completion. Where his teaching fails us we must proceed of ourselves, but what he has done is done on so coherent, matured a plan that we may be sure that any intimation, well pondered, will be susceptible of adaptation. This is true of the intellectual construction which he left unfinished, but it is also true as regards our political or social conduct. And perhaps it is in the highest degree true of our own personal conduct as his disciples. We wish to be co-agents with him, perfecters of his work in our generation. If so, we have to place ourselves under his influence, take up the formation of ourselves as his competent disciples on the principles he has indicated, incorporate him into ourselves subjectively, so as to make our thought and action as little discontinuous with his as it is possible that it should be, thus

most certainly ensuring that our co-operation with him be effective, thus best perpetuating his life and influence.

There is one consideration to which he often recurs, which may at once illustrate and confirm what I have been saying. He often speaks of the social impulsion under which he worked, by which he was urged to this undertaking,—an impulsion not felt as a powerful stimulant anywhere but in France, and by its existence there evidencing that the initiative in the renovation of the human order attached to France, as the result of all past Western history. The impulse in question being due to the convulsions of the close of the preceding century, to the agony of the crisis and its futile compression, would be in its full power at the opening of the first generation that succeeded those convulsions, coincided therefore with Comte's earliest labours. There had been a great movement, with much of hope; a corresponding check, with its discouragement, but without the depressing influence of the various subsequent oscillations which have weakened the following generations. Herein lay the stimulus which rendered possible the creation in one generation of the Positive philosophy and the Positive politics, by the strong excitement of one powerful genius to the necessary inquiry, resulting in the discovery of a basis previously wanting. The tradition of this impulse we should make our own, we who have not been directly subjected to it, who in most cases have grown up under weakening individualist influences, and are only by an effort, whatever the origin of such effort, become amenable to social impressions of any real power. We have lost greatly in point of energy by our deficiency in this respect, and there must be a corresponding exertion to compensate for it. Such exertion may be most facilitated by our conscious and voluntary contact with the mind which translated into their full results the favourable conditions under which it had been developed. It was not possible for any mind to avail itself more successfully of those conditions, to turn them to more glorious gains. This we all allow; and we allow it, I presume, both for the intellectual grasp and moral vigour of our Master. In no point do we, as a rule, we who adopt his conclusions, more need to drink inspiration from his example. The weight of

pressure is against our being influenced by such a tradition, if there is something for it. But without a strong social impulsion we are not likely to effect much. Nothing else, as we may see by every-day experience, will make men useful converts, valuable believers in the new religion. More may be required than this social sentiment, this sense of an urgent demand for the new principle which shall be strong to save mankind from its anarchy and all the attendant evils; but it remains the primary requisite, the fundamental condition, the social analogue of the personal sense of sin demanded for the older dispensation. Intellectual convictions will, as a rule, remain intellectual convictions, calm and self-contemplating, and patient of evils which are not keenly felt. Other parts of our nature must be stirred for action.

Nor need we confine ourselves to the benefits derivable from his example. It is manifest that true social action must proceed from a due activity of the social instincts. He has often pointed out the decay of veneration, the central and in some respects most important of those instincts; and, simultaneously with the decay, he has pointed out the urgency of its revival for the due re-organisation of society. In direct veneration for him personally, as well as respect for His teaching, we might—we should—find a powerful incitement to that social attitude of mind of which I have been speaking; a most useful, if not indispensable, support to our convictions of the truth of his conclusions; a right object for a faculty for which our times,—it must be allowed, times of prevalent weakness,—afford but too little scope: and veneration, it has been rightly said, must have proper objects, cannot be promiscuously given.

There are not wanting, outside of the small body of avowed believers in our religion, those who welcome its central truth, and are ready to allow that in its proclamation there lies a fairer prospect for the race, as well as a real gain for their own selves as individuals. By a different course from ourselves they have been brought so far as to be in a sense on the same path with us, or, at any rate, to intersect our path, free to diverge from it or to consider it as only for a time coinciding with their real road; open also, in many cases, if circumstances favour, to pursue it to its natural

termination. Their participation in our faith is more superficial, and they often feel as little need as desire to accept it more deeply. Such cannot be expected to set the value on it that we do; such, therefore, are free from the obligations which rest on us. Such may look with interest on the formation of a new religion or system, but have little of the same feeling with regard to its Founder. Yet, even when there is only this partial approach to us, this imperfect appreciation of the service done, it is somewhat surprising, when we watch the present distribution of men's honour (observe, I mean, the degree and the subjects of it, and the grounds on which it is paid), to see how grudging, limited a recognition there is of the person who has conferred the benefit in this particular case; how slow some are to admit any claims, how entirely others concentrate their attention on what they have received, without reserving any for him through whom they received it. It is an incidental proof, I conceive, of the entire diversity in kind of his particular service, of its transcendent importance.

We, as disciples of the Religion of Humanity, believe that its foundation is of inestimable value, that in it we have the crown of all the past efforts of our race, the sure guidance and shelter of all its successive generations in the future. We look upon it as being, in the most real sense, the light and salvation of a disordered and suffering world. We are ready to apply to it all the language which the devout and reverent faith of our fathers, of whatever creed, has accumulated to glorify the respective objects of their belief and worship, allowing, I need hardly say, for the necessary modifications, but in no way falling short in spirit of their fervent adoration. We are sensible that a great change is wrought for us, that a great regeneration is offered us, and we wish and seek to profit by it. It is our prayer that the new truth may spread, the new Church rise, so that the blessings of which they are the pledge may rapidly be imparted to the divided families of mankind. All this, and more than this, we are ready to accept. What I would wish to call your attention to, is the obligation which flows from all this, the personal obligation to the special instrument of this new order. We are not of those

who hold that such special organs are superfluous, that Humanity advances collectively, and that her individual servants have no claim on our gratitude. Our whole doctrine protests against any such view; the ordering of the room in which we are confutes it visibly. The opposite judgment enters into and modifies all our thought, and gives new interest and freshness to all our feelings. In all our exertions we evoke the memory of those servants, we would live through their life, and give them life through ours. The greatest service yet done to Humanity must be the discovery of Her to all Her children, the initiating the ultimate revelation which can be made to man. Nor in the future is it possible to conceive of any greater. *He* who rendered it must be Her greatest servant; as such we live most through him, and should seek to make him live through us.

Let us—it is a practice with which, as Positivists, we should familiarise ourselves—project ourselves in thought into the future,—call up, by a judicious exercise of our imagination, the centuries that are to be. We need not be very definite as to the time we overleap, but may suppose ourselves in a state of society in which the Religion of Humanity is triumphant, in exclusive possession, and in which, therefore, all things are ordered in accordance with its precepts. We are fully convinced here that such will be the state of things some day, we cannot tell when. Were we not convinced of it, I presume we should not believe as we do. We may be more or less sanguine, but, to avoid the charge of any excess, we may suppose that the restoration of an order analogous to, if more sound than, that of the theocracy, will take an equal period for its accomplishment to that which has been occupied by the destruction or gradual demolition of its prototype; that the thirty centuries of revolution are to be followed by thirty centuries of reconstruction. The time required in no way affects our conception. We suppose then, in such approximative degree as the imperfection of our constitution allows, which may still be relatively a very high degree, our worship in practice, our faith believed, our *régime* in operation, men's lives in unison with the service they recognise, a permanent

and beautiful order with no oppressive exclusion of constant further progress, the golden age of prophecy and poetry come as a real human possession, the earth become the holy mountain in which they shall not hurt nor destroy. There will still be evils to overcome, but what has been already achieved will render it certain that, within limits assignable by a wise and moderate estimate, they will be gradually removed, and the result of experience will have been to implant in all minds, as the basis of their existence, a loving submission to their aggregate destinies. Humanity will have interposed between the World and Man, tempering his whole environment to a more satisfactory correspondence with his wants. Under the sway of affection man's intelligence will not be inactive ; it will find both in art and science an ample sphere for healthy and pleasurable, as well as useful, exercise. The generations which shall exist under such conditions will not, any more than we who are involved in a far different state, neglect the past—recoil from the government of the Dead. It is inconsistent with the idea of their peculiar service to suppose it. They will look back with reverence on the effort which has placed them where they are. The various epochs of their race's history will be before them, the contribution of each duly recognised. The knowledge we possess of those epochs they will share, if their comparative estimate vary on some points, and if they place them in a somewhat different connection with one another. But with respect to our own period,—that, I mean, in which we are actually living,—it will obviously take its rank in the series ; the generation which is now about half-way through its course, as we count generations for historical purposes, will have its share of attention. With its immediate predecessor, it can never fail to secure a large share ; for if in that the Religion of Humanity was definitely constituted, the actual generation is the first of the new era. And what must be the judgment of the two ? All minor movements, all that seems so important and so absorbing, will pass into its true relative insignificance ; and the master construction, which was being worked out in silence and obscurity in the one, and was launched on its difficult and still obscure course in the other,—the construction to which all will then be conformed,

will pass into its due pre-eminence. The names now prominent will all, in all probability, have disappeared from the memory of men, leaving, as the sole surviving, the name of the author of that construction around which the gratitude of the nations will have gathered imperishably. This certain result we may anticipate in our measure, and place ourselves by so doing in harmony with our successors, at the same time contributing to its attainment. All the honour we can give is as justly due from us to Auguste Comte, as it will be from the remotest of those successors.

Again, to see this more fully, we may vary our supposition, and imagine ourselves at a comparatively early stage of the transition which I have taken so long—from a certain point of view, I doubt not, much too long. We may consider two or three generations as elapsed, and the believers in the new faith more numerous, more organised, and more advanced in their effort to secure its acceptance by the world. We see and feel in varying measure its power to clear the path before us, and to direct our action, so that as little of our strength be wasted as possible, and that we proceed without the delay due to uncertainty. Yet so poor as yet are its results, so faint the impression it makes, that it requires a considerable effort on our part to realise to ourselves its inherent efficacy. Reasoning with ourselves, we arrive at a conviction of that efficacy, I believe, when we are really and in heart disciples; but it is by reasoning, and by the aid of our heart's assent. Many whose intellect it satisfies are unable to arrive at this conviction, and stand aloof in consequence. Still, I think I may say that, in spite of all obstacles, of whatever nature, the conviction of which I have spoken gains ground with most of us; for as fresh problems arise, its power to deal with them is time after time made manifest, and confidence naturally increases as to its universal adaptability. It is a process of rapid growth; each successive advance involves a disproportionate increase of power. We of the present, the first generation, can hardly estimate the rate of that increase when once the impulse has been fairly communicated. Those who succeed us at the distance I have supposed, whatever the difficulties they have to encounter—and they will unquestionably be great—will yet be in a better position,

both as a consequence of past achievement and from the **light** thrown on the conditions they have to deal with, to **estimate** the wonderful capacities of the instrument which **they** wield. They will have no reluctance to invest the **memory** of its maker with the glory it so justly claims. His **name** will be foremost among the great names of the past, **the** watchword and the symbol of the new era of which the **race** will be conscious,—an era of wise and well-grounded hope.

To whichever we turn, to the more complete or the less **complete**,—but in both cases ever advancing,—renovation of **our** race,—the lesson we draw from it on this day is the **same** for ourselves,—the lesson of confidence, of gratitude, of **veneration** for the great Master whom on this day we **commemorate**. It will be seen that, if I reject the name of **Comtist**, it is from no halting in my allegiance and affection, but as a precaution against misconstructions, and I am **confident** that I might say the same of our body in general. The largest, most grateful recognition of our obligations to **Auguste Comte** is not merely an obligation on all who **worship** Humanity, but a necessity for their moral nature which would suffer from any grudging expression. We owe to **him**, and not we alone, a new and nobler life, clearer **conceptions** of duty, higher principles of action. Such are **not** the benefits which we would acknowledge with faltering lips and stammering tongues.

But there is something more to be said. He has associated others with himself, claimed for them from his disciples a share in his glory. His guardian angels enter into the inscription on his tomb; in death as in life, in the subjective existence as in the objective, they must not be dissociated, least of all on occasions like the present. The mother from whom he derived the deep tenderness of his nature; the noble lady whom he venerated as his principal patroness, and to whom he attributed the first impulse that enabled him to become the St. Paul of the new religion; the adopted daughter who watched over and soothed the solitude and lightened the anxieties of his later years,—each of the three should receive her tribute from us, if only for that the sum of their combined influences was so powerful a factor in the work he accomplished. The study which I dwelt on

some time back will bring each before us in turn with an unequal degree of vividness,—in fact with an inevitable faintness in the case of his mother as far as our present means are concerned (the picture will finally become more distinct), but still with a sufficient degree to enable us to estimate them severally and their different contributions. And it is in strict keeping with the Religion of Humanity that we should in the case of its Founder think of him in what I may call this human setting, this atmosphere of deepest natural affections. The medieval saints, even the author of the *Imitation*, have a different environment; their simple, natural, earthly ties fall off them, their relatives may become monks or saints, but the bond becomes a purely religious one, not one of common affection. And the remark holds good of others than saints, as in the instance of Pascal. The reality of our religion is by nothing better evidenced than by this characteristic difference. Its Founder gave free course to the warmest earthly love, and found in it no hindrance to his highest objects.

Some few words of his own may aptly find a place here, as supporting what I have been saying. They form the conclusion of the Dedication of the *Positive Politics* :—
 ‘Farewell, changeless friend! farewell, my saint Clotilda,
 ‘thou who wast to me in the stead of wife, of sister, and of
 ‘child! farewell, loved pupil! true fellow-worker! Thy angel
 ‘influence will govern what remains to me of life, whether
 ‘public or private, ever urging me onwards towards perfection,
 ‘purifying feeling, enlarging thought, ennobling conduct.
 ‘May this solemn incorporation into my whole life reveal at
 ‘last to the world thy hidden worth! Thus only can thy
 ‘benefits now be recognised, by rendering my own performance
 ‘of the mighty task before me more complete. As the highest
 ‘personal reward for the noble work that yet remains to be
 ‘done under thy lofty inspiration, it will be granted perhaps
 ‘that thy name shall remain ever joined with mine in the
 ‘most distant memories of grateful Humanity.’

In his later writings, and as was natural after the foundation of the universal religion, Comte insists constantly on discipline and moral training. The expression ‘souls hungering for moral culture,’ or its equivalents, occurs not

unfrequently,—the thought is constantly recurring. Neglect of this want is the sign of the revolutionary state, its satisfaction the pledge of the cessation of that state. He satisfied it himself by prayer, adoring communion with his chosen representatives of Humanity, by confession, by unceasing watchfulness over himself. It is his injunction on his disciples that they satisfy it, each in his own way, but in some way or other. Step by step this side of his life will become better known; it is to be regretted that it is not better known; perhaps some of the slowness of our advance may be due to its not being known. As our hold on the religion becomes stronger, its dominion over us more all-pervading, we shall see the demand rising for the fuller revelation of our Master's inner life, as a source of light for our own. We have been too lukewarm, too hesitating, too much impressed with the obstacles in our way, too unenquiring after the means of overcoming them latent in what we possess. Here again, by contact with that saintly life, I use the word advisedly, and with justification both by documents and the avowed judgment of others, but with especial reference to the last nine years of it—it had been civic, noble, great throughout,—dormant capabilities might be brought into action, a power of which we had been unaware found within our reach, an impulse of rich promise communicated. Our religious continuity with our Founder has been weak in all of us, if not wholly broken, and it is surely not too much to say that our influence has been essentially weakened as a consequence. We have not passed into the inner heart of our doctrine,—we have failed therefore to gain its full invigoration, and we have failed therefore to make others feel and bend beneath its power. To regain or to establish our full continuity, to revive as immediately as possible the powerful shock of his religious impact, and having revived it to propagate it, this would be our wisdom, our strength, and would also be the best return we could make for all that we have received, the one most in accordance with our Master's deepest wish.

Nor need we be alarmed lest we thus risk some impairment of our vigour, and by an undue stimulation of the religious element lapse into a sentimental exaggeration unfavourable

to that of which we are in constant need, viz., our intellectual and active growth. The example we to-day have before our eyes is sufficient on this point. The work done by Comte in those last nine years of which I have been more particularly speaking, the conditions of anxiety and exposure under which it was done, prove beyond all question—I will not limit myself to the more negative statement—that for the highest exertions of the mental powers, for the noblest display of the moral qualities, a strong paramount religious impulse, a life of prayer, is the indispensable condition. We may with pleasure adhere so far to the unbroken tradition of the Christian Church, to an experience older even than the Christian Church, and founded on the most thoroughly reasoned estimate of our moral constitution. Fearlessly then, in relation to our thought and action, we may rouse ourselves to the practice of the religious life, to habits of worship. I believe that it is our general conviction that such is the case, that we are aware that an excessive preponderance of the religious sentiment is not a danger to which our system is practically liable, that it is the contrary extreme from which we have to keep clear, and that by great effort. It has been my endeavour to show one means by which that effort may be made easier,—by our free use of an example which should be constantly before us, mingling with all our religious aspirations, such aspirations being due essentially to his instigation, when all our earlier impressions in the same direction had lost their power. The depth of our obligations in this respect I leave to your growing appreciation.

Enough will have been said if I have, under more than one aspect, justified our present commemoration and strengthened our sense of connection with him whom we commemorate. Only one real danger do I see. It would be an evil if without conviction we fell into the use of exaggerated language in respect to our Master. Nothing that I have said will, I hope, tend that way. It has been my object to encourage study of his work, in all its parts, his life no less than his teaching, meditation of it, not mere intellectual study, thought rather than reading—and to encourage it with a direct bearing on our own practice. An allusion to this risk of an unpractical attention must be sufficient. My own language may appear

overstrained to some. I must leave it to their ulterior judgment on the fullest information.

If in Humanity each of her individual organs finds its completion, the filling up of that in which it is defective as an exemplar, it yet remains true that each in its measure conveys a portion of her influence, and works directly for her perfecting. We are all the servants of a power to whose advance we can contribute. Whilst time lasts, the number of her elect will be increasing, their contribution will be a service at once required and valued. The thought is more ennobling than the corresponding one in the older religion, the belief of our childhood, where the choice was arbitrary, and the benefit personal. With us there can be no exclusive absorbing claim set up, but there will still be degrees of honour as of usefulness. As in the past so in the future, men will regard some eminent type with a predilection determined by their own peculiar constitution. Yet we cannot be wrong in thinking that Humanity will surround with surpassing glory the memory of him who first set forth her being and attributes,—that through the most distant future the generations of men will assign to Auguste Comte a pre-eminent place among the great spirits, by gazing upon whom they feel that they grow greater, that in their gratitude and their blessing his high endeavour will find its just reward.

I end with his own words: 'Without ceasing to live
'with our noblest ancestors, I live for the future with our
'descendants, till the time come when I live again in them
'and by them, after having lived worthily for them.'

'O may I join the choir invisible,' &c.

George Eliot.

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE

POSITIVIST SCHOOL, 19 Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C.,

*on the 21st Anniversary of Auguste Comte's death, 24 Gutenberg, 90,
(5 September, 1878).*

DE PROPAGANDA FIDE.

COMMEMORATION OF AUGUSTE COMTE.

To give life to a memory ; to continue and enlarge its influence ; to bring home to themselves the teaching it contains ; and to gain an incentive for following in a path which has been trod before them ; such have ever been the objects for which men have instituted commemorations : such are our objects in these annual commemorations of our founder. As the years follow one another, one aspect after another of his life and its work may be studied, one lesson after another brought forward, one portion after another of the course we have to pursue may have light thrown on it, retrospect and prospect being in closest combination for practice. The peculiar nature of the work done ; the foundation of a new religion, the latest born and the most comprehensive, since it assumes all others into itself ; a religion, in fact co-extensive with the race both in time and space, gives us ample room for diversifying our treatment. Last year, the third of this series of annual meetings in England, that treatment was directly personal, dwelling, that is, on the simplest consideration of Auguste Comte's existence and our relation to him through it. His life ; his services, or rather his one capital service, his revelation of Humanity ; his consequent higher degree of identification with Her ; the incorporation of himself and those whom he would have indissolubly connected with him into the power revealed ; how far he had left his work incomplete ; how far his life also was incomplete, broken off at a point when he was entering on his highest usefulness, so that the accumulated force, the gathered way, was lost ; such were some of the points on which I touched in relation to our Master. In regard to

ourselves I spoke of the desirability of our careful examination of his work ; of our placing ourselves, so far as it was in our power, under the same conditions, if we would continue it aright ; of our calling forth in ourselves by a due veneration, a veneration fully justified by an imaginative forecast of the future, the sense of an unbroken continuity with him and his efforts ; that so, by a close contact with him, we might profit both in our conceptions and in our moral advance ; in a word, that we might be his true disciples, bent on affectionately perpetuating his existence, and not merely on conviction the unimpassioned adherents of his system—the two are widely different, and the degrees between the two very numerous. On this personality of relation to him, which is part of what has been lately often spoken of amongst us as the establishment or acceptance of the tradition of Auguste Comte, I insisted as a practical lesson of real moment for all who would further the advent of our religion. For that religion claims to restore veneration to its due place in the moral guidance of mankind, as the essential link between its two contiguous altruistic instincts. It would be a strange omission, an evil omen, if it failed to secure a just share of veneration for him who has inaugurated so great a work. At the same time I stated the limits of such veneration. Auguste Comte is in no way the object of our worship, with whatever loving cultus the gratitude of our own or future generations may surround his memory.

To-day I choose for my subject a point of less directly personal interest, yet easy to invest with such, and it is my desire so to invest it. Dealing with it in the simplest way, in the way most befitting and most congenial to my audience, I shall connect all I have to say with personal utterances of our Master, so placing you in his presence and recalling to you his words ; throwing, in short, as far as I am able, over the whole meeting the warmer character arising from a direct human relation to a lost friend, guide, and benefactor, as distinguished from any thoughtful exposition of his doctrine or construction. I aim at no completeness. I shall not be over careful to guard my quotations. I think you will see, on reference if necessary, why I make them. I shall speak as to fellow disciples, united by common feelings of regret, of

honour, of obedience, of devotion. I shall speak too, as I generally do, not unmindful of the absent who are with us in spirit, who in our own or other countries would gladly join us, nor of others who to-day are met elsewhere to commemorate a great life, to grieve over a premature death.

From the large choice we have offered us I take the question of the propagation of our Faith, and I approach it from one side in particular. I do not mean, that is, to consider its propagation when established in a more or less distant future, the handing down of its belief and practice by one generation to its successor. Nor again do I speak of the method or course of its extension, as it will pass from West to East, from the higher cultivation of Europe through the many stages of civilisation offered by Asia and Africa; nor even, lastly, of the different degrees of rapidity with which it will be accepted by the various constituents of our Western world, in Europe or elsewhere—my scope is a narrower one. I confine myself to the sphere of our own immediate personal action as its believers, and, by virtue of that name, its propagators. Yet here, again, it is not of our efforts that I would speak, or only indirectly or secondarily. My aim is rather to put before you Auguste Comte's views as to the mode of its propagation, to fix your minds on them in their essential features, naturally turning most to such as are most universal, most accessible, I mean, to all; not without an undercurrent of application, but with that in true subordination. In this limited sphere, even, much must be left to yourselves to supply, by reading or by thought, the meditation which is the best of all mental exercises.

Bearing in mind that it is the spread of the religious system which I have in view, in treating of it I observe in a degree the order of time. I recur first to his earliest works, those which form the appendix to the fourth volume of the *Positive Politics*, and which have hitherto attracted too little attention. Thence I pass to the *Politics* themselves, and the works which are in the most close relation with them, treating for the time the *Philosophy* as an episode, and warranted in so doing by Comte's own express judgment. Though earlier than his religious creation, those 'youthful efforts' were, he says, 'in perfect harmony' with his

'matured conception.' There is growth and elevation, there is not divergence. With due allowance for the interval between them in time, with a large modification in the form, there is essential unity of thought. In both divisions of the one work, that is, it is a reorganisation which is contemplated; in the earlier writings, as was natural, it is a social reorganisation; in the latter it is still that, but it is that as the outcome of something deeper and more comprehensive—a religious reconstruction. In both alike we find the distinction observed between the process of construction and that of propagation or establishment. Just conceptions are necessary for the one, they are insufficient for the other. The former rests on observation, the latter calls into play the imagination and the feelings. Thus, at the very outset, it was clearly seen that the reason alone could not change the world. In his own words: 'The mass of mankind will never be inspired with a passion for any system by proving to them that it is one which the progress of civilisation has prepared, and now demands, for the guidance of society. A truth of this nature is accessible to a very limited circle, and for them even demands too long a series of mental operations, to allow of its inspiring an attachment. It can only produce among savants that profound and tenacious conviction, the necessary result of positive demonstrations, which offers a stronger resistance, but for that very reason is less active, than the lively and captivating persuasion of ideas that excite the passions.'

'The only way of obtaining this result consists in presenting a vivid picture of the ameliorations which the new system should bring about in the condition of mankind, regarded under all points of view and apart from its necessity and opportunity. Such a perspective alone can induce men to effect the moral revolution within themselves, essential for establishing the new system. This alone can repress that egotism now rendered predominant by the dissolution of the ancient system, and which, after our ideas have been enlightened by scientific labours, will remain as the only serious obstacle to the triumph of the new social organisation. This alone can draw society from its apathy, and impress on it that active devotedness which is demanded

‘by a social state destined to maintain all the human ‘faculties in constant action.’

‘Here, then, we find a sort of work in which the ‘Imagination should perform the principal part.’ Again: ‘Such is the part specially reserved for the Fine Arts in the ‘general work of social reorganisation. Thus this vast ‘enterprise will obtain the co-operation of all the positive ‘forces; that of the savants to determine the plan of the new ‘system, that of the artists to cause its universal adoption, ‘that of the industrial chiefs to put it into immediate execu- ‘tion by establishing the needful practical institutions ‘In determining, then, the social system suitable to the ‘present epoch, the positive polity invests observation with ‘the supremacy now accorded to imagination. At the same ‘time it confides to the imagination a new and more perfect ‘office than that which the theologico-metaphysical polity ‘assigned to it.’ (*P. P., Vol. IV. p. 567. Tr. Hutton.*)

Such is the earliest statement I quote. We shall see what change it has gradually undergone, what it has become in its latest form, under the full religious development of his first conceptions. The growth is great, but it is the natural unfolding of the germ, with no trace of discontinuity; it is only a vigorous evolution of latent powers.

The quotation given is from a work published in 1822. I pass from it to a consideration of some points in the *Catechism* published in 1852, at a distance, therefore, of thirty years, an interval which had produced the *Philosophy* and the two first volumes of the *Politics*, including in them what we speak of as the ‘*General View*,’ which finds its place in the first volume as the ‘*Introductory Discourse*.’ It had also produced the *Astronomy* and the *Geometry*; but for my purpose, which, I would remind you, is the consideration of Auguste Comte’s plan as to the propagation of the new religion, I proceed directly to the *Catechism*, leaving for future handling any subsidiary remarks derivable from those other works. The preface to the *Catechism* is very definite as to the object of the treatise. It is a ‘small work,’ he says, ‘which stands apart from the general series of my works,’ written in order to put Positivism into a shape which by its condensation can enable it to become, really popular, and for which he

interrupts his great religious construction, half accomplished. He had thought to have delayed it till the full achievement, but with the progress of the great work had come the sense that his principal conceptions were ripe for exposition, and as the political atmosphere seemed also favourable, he turned aside to, or rather intercalated, the task of a direct propagation of the doctrine of reconstruction, the writing of a work which might centre the thoughts of women and working men on the question of a thorough renovation of the existing order.

That existing order must be brought into competition with the new order proposed by the new religion, and the superiority of the latter shown by such competition; but the necessary condition of this competition was the condensation of the new religion—only so could the two rival systems be in practical juxtaposition, so that all might compare them. In the struggle between Christianity and Positivism as a religion, not as a philosophic or political system—the conception of it which was as yet prevalent—and naturally so, as may be seen from the opening sentence of the ‘General View,’ where it is spoken of as essentially a Philosophy and a Polity—in this struggle, I say, between two religions, the earlier had this point of vantage, that it was known and familiar. In expositions longer and shorter, in catechisms and manuals of doctrine and discipline, as well as in the popular consciousness, by virtue of its long existence and its consequent inweaving into the daily experience of life,—the most powerful, if the most unconscious of all influences,—its main features were within the reach of all; the life which it enjoins was appreciable as well as the reasons on which such a life was enjoined. Whether accepted or rejected it was known, whilst its rival was unknown.

Auguste Comte was well aware what had been done by the ‘General View,’ written four years earlier. Never has any human intelligence had more clearly present to it the whole of a great construction, the chart of achievement, the plan of what was yet only projected. We may therefore take it as his deliberate judgment that there was a want which that, his introduction to Positivism, did not meet, and to supply which he wrote the Catechism. And we should ask

ourselves whether that deliberate judgment should not be allowed its full weight in our continuation of his work. I return to this point on all suitable occasions, for I doubt whether we are generally sufficiently given to allow that weight in our daily practice.

Taking the Catechism as it now stands, in obedience to the express injunction of its author, by a change to which he attached the very highest importance, we see that the interval above mentioned has only drawn out into fuller distinctness the conviction that it must be from the imaginative aspect that the new system, now become a religion, must be primarily presented, when it passed from its central belief into the sphere of human appropriation; that it is not as a doctrine, but as a cultus that it must in the first place challenge acceptance. This was his latest, most matured result; one on which he dwells with more than usual emphasis; his attainment of it he speaks of as the removal of serious discrepancies, the remedying of a peculiar defect, a final step nearly missed, condensing his whole religious development—nothing can be stronger than his language, nothing more calculated to draw attention to the matter to which it applies, which, I repeat, is the precedence of the worship over the doctrine in the special work devoted to the propagation of the new religion in the quarters where its propagation was all-important, amongst women and working men. This cannot be disputed by any careful reader of the fourth volume of the *Positive Politics*. In other words, as in spreading a new religion would be but reasonable, it is the most essential feature of religious life which is most prominently put forward, those practices which for the individual, the family, the community, or the church, are the direct, and, for the two last, the visible manifestations of an existence conformed to some religious rule. The appeal to the feelings, and to the imagination as most nearly connected with the feelings, is the first indicated, in strictest accordance with the arrangement observed in the great formula of positive religion, where love precedes order. I am not at present concerned to justify any such determination, but only to state it, and I would not quit the subject without insisting on the fact that the determination was not arrived

at easily and at once; on the contrary, it was the reversal on reflection of a former judgment, all the reasons for which were well weighed and found wanting. This lends additional importance to the actual decision, so far as the expression of M. Comte's own views is under consideration, which is obviously a different thing from our estimate of their value.

I prefer, at present, in reference to the *Catechism*, keeping to this one general feature of the arrangement, so leaving it its proper importance, unimpaired by minor considerations, which also may be supplied by yourselves, and will be most fruitful if so supplied. There are other parts of our Founder's works on which I wish to touch, with the same immediate object, that of enabling us to realise his own conception of the true method of propagation so far as it is a question of teaching or preaching.

The *Appeal to Conservatives*, the complementary work to the *Catechism*, as it is supplementary to the treatment of the Transition, aims rather at the guidance than the conversion of those to whom it is more especially addressed, the actual governors or statesmen of the Western world. Its title, however, conveys a hint to us, as it involves a preference of the conservative elements of society over the revolutionary, as the more hopeful objects of our propaganda. In common with the *Catechism*, it speaks to those whose conditions would naturally debar them from the complete mastery of the system. It differs from it in this respect, that it is a work for the present, for immediate action, not meant for the more complete positive or normal state, not therefore taken up with its exposition. It addresses statesmen, but it does not on that account modify essentially the mode in which the subject is presented. The religion takes, in a work written for eminently practical men, its already established precedence over the philosophy; feeling over intellect; all that concerns religious action over what bears more immediately on social or political advance. It is, throughout, the utterance of the founder of a religion, and supposes that those to whom it is addressed recognise, implicitly at least, the need of one. It puts forward the whole counsel, not such aspects of it as might seem adapted to the peculiar state of its readers; the scientific basis alone receding somewhat

into the background, as was natural, seeing the object of the work. Here again, then, the whole teaches in regard to the order the same lesson as the Catechism, and their author looked on the two works as intimately connected. He speaks of them, in a letter to me, as his two didactic opuscles, the one religious, the other political, in which our propagandist effort is sufficiently systematised. So that we may be sure that in this respect they will throw light on and support one another. He meant them, I may add—it is a point on which a word may not be out of place—to exclude similar attempts; he did not wish general expositions of Positivism. As a system he thought it adequately set forth in them, and the true method of increasing the effect of his own works was by special applications of the doctrine, whilst, as a whole, it only admitted the aid to be derived from poetic creations, in agreement with his judgment that, normally, poetry ranks above philosophy as being nearer religion, at once, that is, more synthetic and sympathetic. A good beginning in this direction of helping the progress of our religion by poetic creation has now been made in this country. It comes from a quarter from which it is most welcome, the highest in importance but one, from the proletariat. It will, I hope, spread deeply and also widely the convictions and feelings which inspire it, above all the strong sense of the necessity of religious unity which it breathes, and of the capability there lies in our purely human Religion of meeting that imperious demand. The adhesion to that Religion of a small but determined body of English workmen, the first fruits, I will hope, of a larger harvest, has been the greatest satisfaction of the past year. The poetic expression is an apt accompaniment of this great practical result.

The practical guidance contained in the first volume of the *Synthèse subjective*,—all that we have left us of his last great work, merely the first volume of a construction equal in extent to its two predecessors, in fact only, not in intention, his last treatise,—may be left for other occasions, with the remark that it has, considered in the general, rather a special application to our own personal religious growth, and our right mental conduct, than any direct bearing on our influence over others, or on the work of propagation in the

sense in which I am at present using the term. Intellectually and morally it deserves a close and requires a separate study, and the result of such study must be the disclosure of its profound religious and devotional significance, as also its high educational significance when we come to the transmission from one generation to another of the scientific acquisitions of mankind. One portion, however, I must not omit to mention briefly, viz., the introduction, which is in such close connection with the Catechism that M. Laffitte has wisely inserted part of it, in its substance, in the second French edition of that work. It is my hope, at no distant period, to give English readers a supplement to the Catechism which will contain the equivalent of that insertion, together with corrections of the errors and omissions which disfigure the English translation as it now stands.

But in strictest connection with the *Catechism* and the *Appeal*, in reference to my proper object, stands the series of annual *circulars*, eight in number. They so far differ from the former works that they are addressed to a differently constituted audience, and have consequently a different object. They are not written for the outside world as the medium from which disciples are to be drawn or as an organisation which is to be guided by a certain influence of the religious system apart from its full acceptance; they do not aim, that is, at conversion, in the one case full, in the other not necessarily amounting to more than a powerful impulse or modification of conduct; they are written, not to the exclusion of other readers, but in their first and simplest intention for adherents and disciples, and this character is more strongly impressed on them the farther we proceed in the series. Almost accidental in their origin, they become more definite in their purpose as they proceed, the temporal element becomes more subordinate to the spiritual, the historical to that which I may call the governmental, or, to give it its highest expression, the pontifical. They are narratives of the progress of Positivism, with observations on the influences which further it or impede it, but they are also, and that increasingly, stamped with the character of works of direction, of what in the older, as well as in a literal sense, might be called edification. The gradual rise in their

conceptions and tone can hardly escape any reader. It is explicitly recognised in the 5th Circular, where he speaks of these annual documents as writings, 'in which for the future 'I have to address seasonable advice to the best adherents of 'the Religion of Humanity.' Such writings are naturally to be carefully consulted when we are studying the action which our Master would recommend for the spreading of his faith. If not large in amount, for the writings are not long, what we can draw from them in this matter of direction is sufficiently definite; and it is in full agreement with the other works which have been mentioned. I will give some few passages which may be of use for our guidance and support.

'True union depends far more on the heart than on the intellect.'

'The religious tendency of the doctrine which alone embraces the sum total of its attributes.'

'The more generous of those who are Positivists by the intellect will finally join those who are Positivists by the heart.'

Nor are such indications as the following to be neglected when the propagation of the religion is in question:—'The 'Revolutionists, the greatest enemies of Positivism;' 'The 'preference of the retrograde to the purely negative state of 'mind;' 'A doctrine which has for its main object to reconstruct order has hitherto only been able to reach the exclusive 'partisans of progress;'—for they show what direction our efforts ought to take, and they depend for their justification on the higher value attaching to those in whom the sounder feelings of mankind have been less impaired, however behind-hand they may be in their intellectual conclusions.

Again, continuing the former series of quotations:—'The 'disease from which the West is suffering requires a treatment 'which shall address itself to the feelings rather than to the 'intellect,' a quotation which immediately precedes the one I have chosen for my motto. 'The heart alone is competent 'to complete and consolidate the convictions which emanate 'from the intelligence, and it can even in many respects 'dispense with them, at any rate so far as regards the general 'assistance which every great construction needs.' This particular quotation we should thoroughly examine, as it has

most important bearings on our propagandist movement, on our growth as a church. I continue it: 'I shall,' says M. Comte, 'not look on the Positivist Fund as having acquired
 • 'a satisfactory consistence till such time as its chief support shall be from those who are impelled to contribute by their sympathies, instead of depending on intellectual adhesions, which are always liable to waver on the first shock.' So farther on he speaks of 'the instability of conviction due above all to inadequacy of feeling.' Hence he was led to appeal to even sincere theological believers for contributions, as capable of giving from sympathy their aid to his great work; to appeal, in short, to all truly religious minds as disposed to synthesis by sympathy.

Once again, from the same Circular, the 6th. 'True
 'Positivists will, through the instrumentality of veneration, rise above all secondary divergences, and placing the heart above the intellect, will actively turn to its full utility the convergence which underlies them all.' Again: 'Besides that Positivism alone has justly estimated the sum of the services rendered by Catholicism, at the present day it seeks to secure a sense of its habitual importance, either as offering resistance to the tendencies to mere subversion, or as keeping up a moral culture, the continuance of which in an imperfect form is always preferable to its disuse. From both these points of view Positivism must shortly become the systematic defender of Catholic habits against the counter impulsion derived from Protestantism.' This is important as regards our language and action when Roman Catholicism is in question. Again: 'Its office as regards order can only be discharged since it has become fully religious. It is under this final form that it should henceforth direct the propagation of Positivism, now rendered capable, by a sufficient elaboration, of meeting our great want, viz., "the reconstruction on system of the spiritual order, whilst the several governments maintain on routine principles the material or temporal order."'

In his last public utterance, the 8th Circular, dated 15 Moses, 69 (15 Jan., 1857), we may find expressions with the same general tendency. He speaks therein 'of the religious league which is gradually to overcome the combined

'tendencies to irreligion by its exclusive capacity for bringing into convergence Catholicism, Islam, and even Protestantism —of Positivism as alone returning to and realising the programme laid down by the Middle Ages : the regulation of human life, private no less than public, by the subordination of the intellect and activity to feeling, whereas it is the two former which the moderns have exclusively cultivated.' Again, we have the statement that 'the peculiar gravity of our disorder consists in its naturally having spread to the affective region of the brain, where it unduly excites pride and vanity, whilst it compresses veneration, and as a consequence, the other two instincts of sympathy.' We have a warning even as 'to the fatal connection between moral corruption and emancipation in speculation and action, by virtue of the growing abandonment of the culture of the affections.' Again, he speaks of 'religious habits, as consolidating the true unity and alone able to ensure full efficiency to the renovating faith'; of his own 'daily private prayers, his religious exercises, as the source for the last eleven years of all his advance of whatever kind.' Again, he recurs to the 'support of all truly religious souls, especially women, who, without sharing our faith, will second our efforts'; as to the 'weakness in ourselves traceable to the circumstance that the doctrine which constitutes the Religion of Humanity on the subordination of the intellect to the heart, has as yet only been able to reach feeling through the intelligence, by the substitution of conviction for persuasion. The results thus obtained are a sufficient indication of the rapidity of its advance when the preaching of Positivism, become at length more poetical than philosophical, shall have directly taken its normal character and its natural destination.' Meanwhile it is emphatically declared that the slow rate of progress is rather to be imputed to Positivists themselves than to the public which they address, and still less to the existing governments, especially in France'; to us, his disciples, in short, not to our milieu.

It is easy to see from all these extracts that where such preference was given to the feelings over the intellect in the work of securing the acceptance of the Religion of Humanity, the greatest importance would attach to the right training of

feeling,—its due encouragement. And so it is, as may be shown by direct statements no less than as a consequence of that which has gone before.

Perhaps the most emphatic passage as to the importance of religious habits is one to which I have already alluded elsewhere. It is in one of the later additions to his will, where he says that men are called complete Positivists when they reject no important dogma, but that he had chosen as executors none but those in whom regeneration had passed from convictions to sentiments. Even here, however, there was a third stage rarely reached, that third and last degree of conversion, the only conclusive step practically, when it extends to habits.

But it will not be alien to my purpose, or at variance with what has gone before, if I take some other less direct, yet very plain, indication of Comte's sense of the value of religious habits strictly so called, of religious culture. You are familiar with passages in which he puts forward the daily use of Thomas à Kempis' *Imitation* as desirable for all his disciples. Now no man was less inclined to the indulgence of mere feeling. When, therefore, such a work is strongly recommended, it must be from its power to promote, through its appeals to our feelings, our own inward discipline as the most wholesome source of our outward action, that sustained energy of action which should characterise the disciples of our human religion, which is, by its very idea, a religion of activity. I say, by its very idea, for it throws all responsibility for the advance of the race, for the tempering of its destinies, physically or morally, on the successive generations of individual human agents, leaving them no external power on which they can lean for aid. They can have, that is, no supernatural reliance; and such assistance as is derived from outward nature, the world of animate or inanimate objects in which we live, must be got by human activity shaping or guiding the agencies which are not human. So much is this the case, that those who but give a glance at the new religion as a thing under discussion, gain an impression too frequently that hardness and coldness are its more prominent features, an impression without other intelligible ground than, firstly, the importance it attaches to

science as its basis; than, secondly, this inevitable characteristic of activity imprinted on it, such impression deriving support in those who admit it, from the conviction that there is not sufficient room for the influence of feeling where the present and the outward are so absorbing as under the dominion of science and industry they would seem to be. For others then, as for ourselves, it is important that we should make it clear that our faith strongly inculcates the formation of religious feelings and habits, the encouragement of a devotional frame of mind, and herein, I may add, there is that which at once justifies and demands the forms of religious expression which we have adopted in our services here, with the object of promoting the propagation of our doctrine. Defects in conception or execution are comparatively unimportant; scant adhesion, or other difficulties, all must be held as naught, in comparison with the primary duty—in this as in other respects duty for us coinciding with our true well-being—of evidencing to those who will see it that we, as believers in the Religion of Humanity, claim for it the fulness of religious competence, a devotional, not less than a practical or intellectual, completeness. Perhaps we began too late, rather than too early, from over-prudence or weakness of faith, not sufficiently bearing in mind, not sufficiently instinct with the spirit of the traditional formula of our predecessors: ‘Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,’ a formula which we may unhesitatingly adopt as applicable to Humanity.

The habit of private prayer can be of only indirect bearing on others in so far as it renders us better. It might be complete and long-standing, and yet, from our mode of life, unknown, not therefore an immediate influence on others, who might judge us, as Mohammedans are said to judge Protestants, as men having no religion. As a means of propagation, then, if it be only the propagation of a correct estimate of our religion, private worship in some sort yields to public, be that public, as it is with us, from our necessity, more domestic in its character than in any full sense public. In any other light I need not say how very superior the habit of private worship is; none of us, surely, need reminding of

that truth, nor is it one for present insistence. But as, owing to the indirectness of its action, the latency of its power, immediately it must be second to the more congregational cultus, of which it is the best support and impulse, so must it be also to the life which it informs and illuminates, in which it is the hidden source of that life's supreme inherent power to influence and convert. Nor is there any doubt that this is the relation between life and worship which M. Comte assigned the two as means of propagation. On this I need not multiply quotations. One, simple and accessible to all, will be enough. Stronger statements might be found; your memory will perhaps supply them. I take mine from the preface to the Catechism (p. 11): 'It is for the nascent priesthood of Positivism, and for all its true disciples, by their conduct as men and as citizens, to secure a due appreciation of its excellence. Even those who cannot be expected to form a judgment on its principles may be led by experience to a favourable conclusion. A doctrine which shall be seen to develop all human virtue—personal, domestic, and civic—will soon gain the respect of all honest opponents, however strong may be their preference for an absolute and egoistic, as opposed to a relative and altruistic, synthesis.' The language is most quiet, but the meaning is none the less clear, that it is in a conduct in harmony with our religion that lies our highest power for conversion.

Allowing to the full this truth, I return to the question of that secret discipline which the recommendation of Thomas à Kempis' great work shows to have occupied so much of our Master's thought in regard to his followers. It is a sufficient indication that he was in full agreement with all his predecessors, the religious teachers of all ages or countries, as to the value of constant religious culture apart from that which comes from right action, of a direct training of the feelings, the formation of what I have already spoken of as devotional habits, reading, meditation, and prayer—all portions of one idea, inward communion. Perhaps the necessity of such habits may become clearer to us, more consonant to the conclusions of our reason, by the two following considerations. First: it is a marked feature of the whole of M. Comte's re-organisation—a feature which is extremely

repellent, but which is inseparable from it, and, as inseparable, to be gradually rendered less repellent by familiarity, that it invokes throughout the idea of discipline. The function of the new religion is to discipline all the forces which have been fostered by the previous existence of man. We know how those who wield the said forces feel that this is its claim, and we know also how, in plainest English, they kick against it. But not now dwelling on the larger application of this regulating power, let us bring the matter home to ourselves, and consider the, at first sight, somewhat stern discipline which our religious conceptions involve when they are fully mastered, and when we come to translate them into action. Consider the watchful control which all our personal instincts require—nay even, in a degree, our unselfish; consider, again, the intellectual discipline prescribed, the abstinence from that mental dissipation which the age in which we live so encourages in every direction; consider, thirdly, the constant reference to others, which is bound on us by our social faith, as opposed to the confiding trust in our natural impulses, which is a popular doctrine; at every turn it is discipline which meets us. And where is strength sufficient to be found?—nowhere but in the feelings rightly cultivated by devotional habits. Secondly: we wish to act healthily on others, be it in education or in life, to use a common distinction. That is, we foresee, or we see, results which are undesirable, which may in the one case be prevented, in the other be remedied, by a right influence brought to bear; and yet there is no other influence for good which is in any sense within our power but that which is traceable to a rightly formed character, the influence which goes out from us; which is not consciously exercised by us. But to be wholesome it must, in so far as it is a permanent power for disciplining others or for contributing to that end, be the expression of our own self-discipline. And here, again, the question arises: Where are we to get the energy which will make us discipline ourselves? The impulse to it may come from deep feeling, but the sustenance of that impulse will require the force of habits, be their form what they may,—we are left the greatest liberty in this respect,—but in some form or other they must be

habits of a devotional character, in the complete sense of the term.

But enough on this point. Probably our difficulty is one of practice, rather than of theory. We have, as in the case of the young, to resist the counterpressure of all or nearly all our external influences, and especially of the mode of thought in which we have been growing; or, as with the older, to act against a long course of disuse which has weakened all our earliest impressions, making a disastrous breach in our continuous religious life; or, lastly, where there has been least of this, we may find it hard in the new order to adjust our language and the conceptions which it should embody; in each of the three cases there is a practical obstacle to be set aside, yet there is much aid to our overcoming it, in a convinced determination that it would be wise to overcome it. I will assume it to be overcome, or in the course of being so. The first evidence of this result would be in ourselves, and would be soon extended to others. It would be seen that there was in our lives an impulse of power, expressing in our general action that we had something which was a distinctive principle, directing us in all the details of our most ordinary conduct. Its second manifestation would be and that shortly, wherever circumstances at all admitted of it, in our family life. Personal religious habits would impel us to introduce into our domestic habits something which might show that they were not a mere personal advantage. It has ever been so in the older religious life; it will be so in the religious life of Positivism. Some simplest, most elementary joint action of the family will be adopted, as a first step towards systematic domestic worship. So from the personal and domestic sphere there will penetrate into our public life a real unity, which it will always lack whilst this base is wanting. Its great interests, and the thoughts and action which they call out, will act beneficially on the more restricted portion of our existence, but they will ultimately receive more than they give. To this truth Auguste Comte seems to me to have given increasing prominence as he advanced, as was but natural when we consider his later years. And I may here say that, possibly, what we now most stand in need of is the publication of the

papers which would give us the right insight into those later years. Nothing would so kindle our religious aspirations, nothing would so completely redeem Positivism from the charge of deficiency in religious warmth.

Yet I would leave no onesided impression. And therefore I place here a quotation which brings forward another aspect of his and our work, and that with great distinctness: 'The disastrous revolt of reason against feeling will never be terminated till the Priesthood can satisfy the claims of 'modern intellect.' These words may serve to remind us of the great and dangerous labour that all will have to undergo in their intellectual training, and which has more especially to be faced by the Priesthood as charged with the spiritual direction. If I have used the epithet 'dangerous,' it is justified as expressing our Master's feeling on the point. The science on which we must rest was in his eyes something above which we must rise, clearing ourselves from any subjection to it, emancipating ourselves from its control as much as, though with greater difficulty than, we emancipate ourselves from any other hurtful dogma, say, the doctrine of equality or the supremacy of the individual judgment. To him, as to St. Paul, it was clear that knowledge puffeth up. The unavoidable process of acquiring it becomes then a permanent danger, a necessary evil, against the influences of which all precautions have to be taken at the time when it has to be undergone. That time over, the wholesome action of practical life will come to the aid of the great majority; whilst in the case of the Priest as more completely and longer exposed, there will be a safeguard in the educational purpose which will preside over all his efforts with a constant tendency to moralise them and leading him intellectually to a most rigorous concentration. Be the danger what it may, however, it has to be met. The fulness of knowledge, relatively to our wants, must be sought, and the practical consideration for all on whom it is incumbent to seek it, is to strive after the right spirit in its pursuit.

'*Éminemment féminine*'—pre-eminently the religion of women,—is one of the expressions applied to our religion by its Founder. And all his later writings show the increasing power of this conception over him, how towards it all his

constructive genius turned, by intenser sympathy reaching towards a more complete unity of synthesis. This may be accepted as the true direction, or rejected on various grounds, but it cannot be denied that it was his direction. If we seek to understand it, either in the light of past experience, or in that of our present difficulties, I mean the difficulties of our larger social environment, or as a rational issue raised by the whole mental and moral constitution of man, we shall gradually arrive at the conviction that the expression above quoted is pregnant with guidance for us, whether we aim at a complete possession of our faith for ourselves, or at the successful imparting it to others. Contrasts which otherwise offer much resistance disappear when brought into the light of this idea. I am content to instance one: the contrast between the revolutionary and conservative elements in society which seem to demand from us such different presentments of our system. Ignore this contrast in a great degree, and act as though we had principally to deal with the acceptability of that system by women, and I have little doubt that the result will amply justify the wisdom of our decision.

But then if it is permanently the religion of women that we its disciples of both sexes are engaged in spreading, what must be its leading characteristic? Not the energy of practical life, nor the coldness inherent in the intellect, but that which is the highest womanly quality, tenderness. We cannot, as a matter of reason, avoid this conclusion; our judgment leads us to accept it as accordant with the one voice that comes forth from all the higher religious aspirations of mankind: we have therefore but to work it into our practice. We have, that is, throughout, to see that we make this leading characteristic felt to be such in regard to ourselves first, then to others. We may be sure that we are not without responsibility for the opposite impression which is widely spread. But whether we are or not, it is equally true that our efforts should be directed for all reasons to change this impression where it exists, to implant a wholly different impression where the ground is yet open. And tenderness is not weakness, nor in the English sense of the word, sentimentality,—far from it. We need not

shrink from it as such ; it is quite consistent with the greatest strength. And, as a rule, we may give free play to what we have of it in our nature. Neither in man nor woman, in adult life, does it seem to me, as at present, in excess ; as a moral function of our imaginative judgment of others, it can hardly ever be so.

We have not hitherto, perhaps, ever realised to ourselves our religion on its gentler side, or at least not fully. All I have said, however unsystematically ordered, has had for its object to draw out, first, Auguste Comte's preference for that side, and, secondly, to lead you to the adoption of that preference as a dominant conception, as a master principle of conduct. Consistently with the occasion the former has been most prominent, for that should speak most of him. We cannot stand by, or offer outward tributes at, his grave, but we can worthily honour his memory and that of his guardian angels by an act of spiritual communion, such act being then most appropriate when most inspired by the spirit of sympathy, or tenderness, most appropriate to the complex conception of the group he wished formed, most appropriate to him in especial, inasmuch as there is no quality which by nature and by cultivation, through all discouragement and suffering, was more peculiarly his own, none which careful observers more recognise as his than its lovingness. Justly did he value the insight of a disciple who addressed him (it was in Spanish) as the 'sympathetic philosopher ; justly did he claim to be the most loving of all the bearers of that noble name.

I end as I began by placing you under the influence of our Founder's memory. Trust me it were a great loss were we indifferent to its inspiration.

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE

CHURCH OF HUMANITY, 19 Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C.,

on the 22nd Anniversary of Auguste Comte's Death,

24 Gutenberg, 19 (5 September, 1879).

*RETROSPECT.—THE INFLUENCE OF AUGUSTE
COMTE'S LIFE AND TEACHING.*

It seems necessary, from time to time, even at the risk of a charge of repetition, to guard so far as we can against certain misrepresentations. Not long since I saw in a periodical, which is not unfair to us in its general spirit, the statement that we substituted Humanity for God, Auguste Comte for Jesus Christ; the two holding the same relative position in their respective religions. It is not so, and it has been said over and over again that it is not so. We may see that it is not so if we remind ourselves that Christianity cannot be thought of without Christ. The Religion of Humanity, or the Positive Religion, or Positivism—no one of these three terms, and they are the only three open to fair opponents to use at present, necessarily recalls the Founder's name, any more than Islam necessarily recalls Mohammed, or the Medieval Catholicism St. Paul; so little so, that the Society which represents St. Paul, the Roman Catholic Church, has placed his name below that of St. Peter—has disallowed, in fact, his legitimate claim. With regard to Islam, it has been one of the arts of controversial unfairness to identify it as far as possible with him who only claimed to be its prophet or apostle, so the better to conceal its large amount of agreement with, its complete acceptance of, the religion of Jehovah as set forth by Moses, so the more to damage it by veiling its pure Monotheistic character and weighing it down by any imperfections that attach to its proclaimer. If, for convenience, we use in the West the terms Mohammedan and Mohammedanism, we ought not to forget that true controversial courtesy requires a different language, that Musalman or Muslim are the names for the disciples, Islam the proper name for the creed. By a similar act, with equal

unfairness, the opponents of the Religion of Humanity are fond of calling it Comtism, and no disclaimer will at present affect their conduct, for the device is too useful as a weapon of controversy.

Apart from this consideration, in Christianity such as it has existed and exists for its highest teachers and truest disciples throughout its now long existence, Christ is God. And this conclusion of the earlier ages, when the religion had to meet the strain put upon it by the death of the old, the birth of the new Society, will be ratified more and more by its believers in these later times, when it is amid the throes of a greater, if at present less visible convulsion, the convulsion of its own dissolution from within and the birth of a new religion to supersede it. The vague and flaccid conceptions which at present occupy with many the place of the more coherent theological system which was our earlier faith, will give way from their own weakness, and from the necessity of facing the one great difficulty: if Christ be not God, where is his indefeasible claim to the allegiance of mankind? As man, his life and work, whatever their value, which I touch not here, have no title to supersede the collective effort, the collective life of his fellow men.

In a word, we are met here to-day not to bow in worship before a divine, but to commemorate a human being, the revealer to his fellow men of a new faith, of a new Power, or a Power not as yet acknowledged, but in no sense the object of that faith, or in any sense one with the Power revealed—one, I repeat it, who holds the position in the Religion he proclaimed, which Moses, St. Paul, or Mohammed, hold in their respective religions, not that which Christ holds in his, as he has been confessed by the Christian world of past times.

The spirit in which we would perform this our act of simple commemoration is one of venerated gratitude for all the benefits which the life and thought of him whom we commemorate have brought to us. We would not be unjust to our past, or in any way undervalue the continuity which should keep it in close connection with our present. We would gratefully acknowledge the great debt we owe, most of us, to its lessons and its training. To show how we cling to that continuity, it may be sufficient here to say that the

full significance of those lessons and that training is best seen from the vantage ground of the new Religion, which, as we would use it, calls us back from the neglect, or even contempt, into which we had fallen, or were falling, as concerned the earliest forms of truth, and teaches us how we may turn to useful purpose, and still respect, all that was best and noblest in our previous life. Hereby we are most in accord with our Master's guidance, most faithful to the spirit of his teaching, that there should be no break between the ages, least of all between our own and the great system which is in time its direct predecessor, the imposing Catholicism of the Middle Ages.

It is the 25th anniversary of Auguste Comte's death, if only the seventh annual commemoration of it in England. A quarter of a century has elapsed, that is, since his disciples were left to carry on his work without his guidance, by the aid of the writings he had left, and such memories as survived of his life and teachings. But few here can remember the shock of his death, the first impression of the greatness of the loss. As far as I know, there are scarcely ten of the existing English Positivists who can recall that time. This may serve to show us by anticipation that the period between then and now has not been without its results, if we consider our actual numbers. To the few who can recollect it I need not bring back their sorrow and alarm, any more than I need dwell on the excitement of returning courage and of gathering hope which took the place of the first depression. In the mature resolution which animates us to-day we feel something of regret for that early enthusiasm.

My immediate object is rather the intermediate time which ends with to-day, the first twenty-five years of our existence as a church, with more especial reference to Auguste Comte, as is but natural. By way of introduction I will remind you that his existence was incomplete, that we do not possess his full thought any more than we have been subject to his full action, that his life ended prematurely, broken off at a very critical period. We have so much, that we are apt to forget how much more we should have had, had his life been continued to the ordinary term even. When I remind

you that we have not his system of moral science,—his theoretic and practical morals,—nor the education based thereon; again that we have not the theory of human industry which was to end the third series of his constructive works, I say enough to give you the measure of our loss in the sphere of thought. For *Morals and Industry*, both in theory and practice, to one who attentively considers our difficulties, personal and social, in the present transitional time, are the two cardinal points on which all turns.

In the short earliest notice of his death which circulated among his then adherents, it was stated that a look of inexpressible grief passed over Comte's face when he felt that he was dying. This reminds us of an earlier expression, which he used after the completion of the introduction to the '*Politics*,' the '*General View*,' as we know it: 'I should have died in despair if I had not written it.' The outline of his conception and construction, their leading principles at any rate, was secured to the future in that work, would have been lost without it. Between its publication and his death it had been developed into his principal work, the '*Politics*,' and so had receded in importance, receded, that is, into the position of a preliminary discourse, still retaining very great value. In the '*Politics*,' the construction, no longer in outline, but in all its essential features, was fully worked out. But Comte, with the consciousness of what was done, was aware of what remained to be done by him as a thinker and writer, and the feeling that it was left undone and handed over to the uncertain chances of the future, is of itself sufficient to explain the look of which I have spoken.

But he was aware, also, of the state in which he left his adherents, the small body of disciples who of late years had gathered round him, the bond of cohesion being his own personality. He well knew how imperfect their cohesion was, nay more, how imperfect their adhesion, what point they had reached, in what they fell below the standard he set before them, how small their number, how arduous their task. We cannot be long now without his will and its accompaniments, the publication of which was decided on last year. His will will show his estimate of the actual

disciples, and how he wished to live to bring to bear more fully on them and their children the influence he had been gradually acquiring. The loss in this respect has been incalculable, and the consciousness of it may have darkened his spirit in death.

He could not anticipate, he thought he had provided against, one unfortunate circumstance—the long delay in completing such a portraiture of his existence and purpose as the will and its accompaniments would have given. It has been explained from time to time whence that delay has arisen. There need be no further hesitation, so far as I know, in giving to the world much of the materials by which he may be better appreciated personally, and which will not only do that, but will serve as helps for our direction by their clear indication of the road we have to take. Nor is it only his own personal influence that will thus be set in its right light and allowed its due weight. We shall also gain,—and there is more than one point on which we want it—the influence of Madame Clotilde de Vaux, and, through her, of the two others who are inseparable from her henceforth. It is, after all is said, the saddest reflection that a very great man should not only have been so hampered and persecuted during his life, but that not till at least a quarter of a century after his death should it be in the power of his disciples to execute his will in its most important part; that for that long period the means to which he looked for moulding and urging forward the great movement should, by an unfortunate fatality, be wholly unavailable.

To place within reach of his English disciples one additional portion of his work of direction, I have had lately printed, and they are procurable here and elsewhere, at Messrs. Trübners' for instance, the circulars which he issued during the last eight years of his life. Their value cannot be contested, even few as they are. What would it have been had he lived, as he had hoped, to the age of Hobbes (91) and so the eight had been thirty years of direction, each marked by its own peculiar growth, by its more ample embodiment of a true priestly guidance in the difficult conditions of our early advance, and in the midst of the tumultuous disorder in which we have been living? Pass in review the more prominent

events of the intervening period since the short series closed, and say if we can adequately estimate the loss we have sustained in not having had the yearly interpretation of those events which would have been given in his Encyclical.

Had it been possible to give earlier effect to the wishes of Auguste Comte we should have been long in possession of as complete a picture of him as is attainable for any great man, whereas we have had only a fragmentary representation. And it was no mere personal, individual interest that inspired those wishes. Quite otherwise. All with him had a social significance, and he knew that the thorough renovation which was his aim would be rendered less difficult for his disciples, in proportion as they could vividly place before themselves their teacher's efforts in the same direction for himself. To revive the lost, or, at any rate, decaying habits of piety and devotion which had been the strength of earlier ages, the determined and daily cultivation of our higher nature, was for him the indispensable condition of a sound advance, one to which he conformed in a degree which but few know as yet. But the process of destruction had gone so far that a powerful remedy was needed. None so powerful as a near example, one which might come home to each man's personal consciousness, of how the difficulties which his time brings with it might be met, had been in fact successfully met; for here was one who had himself felt in their fullest degree all the revolutionary tendencies and impulses (his earlier letters show this at times, with even painful distinctness), but who had overcome them and had cast them behind him, preserving only the revolutionary fervour and social impulsion. Here was one who could clear himself with the most logical consequence of all the older belief, and yet see that the spirit from which and the practices in which that belief had issued were of eternal importance to man; one who could accept in its utmost limit, so far as it was necessary, the work of destruction, but who was throughout alive to the transitory character of all destruction, the permanent necessity that a new order should emerge from it, and replace the old. In the same sense as the other great benefactors of our race, whose effigies we see around us, if in higher degree, we look to Auguste Comte as a type, the more complete and applicable by

virtue of his closer connection with our actual wants and condition.

More fortunate than most of their predecessors, those who shall now come to the new Religion will have a fuller possession of the great assistance derivable from the example of him by whose teachings they are initiated in their faith. The last days of the first generation of disciples, the first days of the second, can hardly fail to have access to all that remains of their Master which is connected with what I have been dwelling upon, his personal religious life. Not till that is open to all can the world be said to have Auguste Comte fully before it. Think not, however, that I anticipate a ready acceptance, an easy victory for our religion in this different and more hopeful state. There is much to prevent such anticipation. I know the strength of the older ideas, and the difficulties attendant on the new, sufficiently to be prepared for an immediate increase in some directions of the present opposition, but I am prepared also for some increase in our power of meeting it by the intrinsic strength of the means then placed within our reach.

I have said enough to show why it is that even now the day of our commemoration is a day of mourning, for that a great task was left unaccomplished, a great service withdrawn. Let me now, as the occasion warrants, remind you in most rapid outline of what we owe him, for regret cannot be the prevailing note. We owe him the new impulsion which the world is said to be looking for, and which as yet it partly will not, partly from ignorance cannot, accept from him. For he offers us a clear conception of human life as it has been, as it shall be, and as it is. Without any idle question as to whether all things are for the best or for the worst, he teaches men to see things as they are, and to see the use to which, as they are, they may be put. Relieving us from all the ungrounded hopes and fears which have been, and are yet, so powerful, he inspires us, as our greater forefathers have been inspired, with the consolatory hopes of a brighter future for man. Freed from vain claims and pretensions which to man as to men have ever been fraught with suffering, recoiling on the pride which cherishes them, we yet feel through his lessons that we have a noble function

and no unworthy destiny, if we reverently and gratefully accept our position as men.

The relations of man to the outer world, the controlling power of that outer world, so unavoidable and so salutary, and man's capacity within limits for directing such power,—the relations of man within his own sphere,—of the former generations to our own,—of our own to them and to the future,—the close inter-dependence which binds together the several parts of Humanity, considered in its entirety as a continuous whole, as well as when it is considered as a present whole,—the bonds which unite men in families,—the rise from the family to the larger unions of states and church,—the play of the different parts of the social organism with their several functions;—on all these points he has combined the teachings of the past, and given them new value by the new combination.

We are taught by him to see ourselves and others, throughout, as social beings, as, with our will or against our will, parts aiding one another and serving a whole, creatures of those from whom we have descended, labourers in the service of our descendants. By all that has been done for us, by all that we can do for others, we are roused from the narrow individual view of self, and awakened to the power of our nature, if duly disciplined and cultivated. We owe, therefore, to our Founder a new view of ourselves, one in which all parts of our nature find their satisfaction. We learn to value highly a strong personality, but we bind it by the operation of our will, and as the conclusion of our reason, to the service of our kind. We save ourselves from ourselves by giving ourselves a higher destination in a life lived for others. Independence is encouraged, but submits itself voluntarily to the co-operation which is essential to the common welfare. We learn to value a strong reason, and a most definite and energetic character—always under the same condition—of their subservience to the good of the whole as a voluntary act. So the largest perfection given to each individual is made to minister to the perfecting of the society to which he is under every point of view a debtor. The same holds true of the family, whose separate interests, as we learn under this social morality, can never rightly be

disjoined from those of the state. Thus it is with the state. It again can have no separate interests. It must bind itself to serve the whole. Never were we better placed than now for appreciating the greatness of the change this new truth introduces. For whilst it is, as we may see every day, receiving the reluctant acquiescence, as far as language goes, of one state after another, the practice of all, almost without an exception, is in direct conflict with it. I repeat it; it is practically a new conception of human life which Auguste Comte has wrought out of the scattered truths of the past, and at every turn it affords us new prospects and new motives for action. So far as we avail ourselves of it we clear off the encumbrance of self, we see all around us in a juster light, we gain nobleness of purpose and energy in execution.

If we think for a moment how we regard all the questions that are being discussed, how we feel about them, we shall soon realise the change in us wrought by Auguste Comte's teaching. Still more if we remember how those around us in large majority feel and think on the same points. They are quite awake to the difference, and are not slow to reproach us with it. Nor is it merely with reference to single questions that this difference is felt. Acknowledging, as we are bound to do, that more are coming to our conclusions on many of the most prominent subjects, we can yet see, and it is hardly disputed, that we have had given us some principles of judgment that are not common to others, and which enable us, however alone, however apart from others we may be, with a security that others do not feel, to say what will be the decision arrived at by those who in general agree with us on each point as it arises, such decision not being a chance one, but the application of some principle common to them and to us. This safe leading we owe to Auguste Comte. We owe him also a more noble gift, if we will but use it. He endows us with a larger range of sympathy in the freedom of our common humanity. It is the special privilege of our religion that it not only condemns no other, but respects all others, and incorporates their truth. By virtue of this privilege, its believers, without any concession, can profit by all that the

past offers, they are free of Humanity throughout its whole duration, they are in communion with the whole race of mankind on the particular point which has hitherto most divided men. All other sympathies follow on, and are included in, this. We may be glad to think that others are fast approaching us on this ground; everywhere we see signs of the extension of human sympathies; but not the less ought we to trace this progress to its true source. For it is through Comte's teaching that the unity of Humanity under all diversity has been placed on a firm foundation of reason.

For Auguste Comte himself, what has been the result of the twenty-five years on which we are looking back? It has hardly been such as he anticipated. General experience led him to expect that his death would remove the obstacles to his recognition, and that all personal rivalry ceasing, or being silenced, the just tribute to his services would be paid, whilst the admiration and gratitude of men would render easier the progress of his doctrine. Had he been a pure thinker it would probably have been so. But his work is one of direction, government, and religious organisation, and touches directly, not the thought of mankind only, but its interests and passions. As such, it enlists active minds in its support, but it also and more rapidly awakens jealousy and dislike. Apart then from the misfortune I have before noticed, viz., its interruption and the imperfect knowledge men have of it, in itself it was such as to make it probable that its ascendancy and that of its author would be longer in coming.

Be this as it may, certain it is that his name has remained much more obscure than those who accept his teaching could have expected. Yet, whilst allowing this, we may see that there has been a constant advance, that one after another those who seem to overshadow him decline, and his superiority makes itself felt. We may infer that this is so, I think, without risk of error, from the fact that there is less of ridicule, more of vehement hostility, aroused by his name. There prevails, unless I greatly mistake, a sense that there is in the man whom so many would set aside or ignore a latent power with which they must reckon. It is seen, again, that however small the band of followers, it does not decrease,

that no other among the new teachers of the period exercises this power of drawing men towards him for joint action,—it is different, of course, where no action is in question,—and that he exercises it in the face of the fact that there is no outward encouragement to those who feel its strength. It is seen that silence and open attacks alike fail against him. Silence ceases to be possible, for the various wants of mankind force attention to a scheme which deals with them all, and in one language after another, in one country after another, men will speak of that which interests them, and require that those to whom they resort for teaching should also speak to them of it. By the enlargement of intercourse any artificial pressure in one quarter is rendered inefficient, partial judgments are overruled. I might sum up all by saying that as religion is the central want for man, when the form which is in possession is seen to be decaying, the offer of a new one is sure to be scrutinised, and if it has any real value, sooner or later it will have a trial allowed it. Religion is the government and direction of man in their most complete and valid form; how should an age which is without such government and direction not ultimately turn, however reluctantly, towards a new growth—and, to the teacher from whom the promise emanates? If, then silence is impossible, will opposition crush our Master's influence? As yet it has not done so, and we need not fear that it will do so. All serious candid opposition should be welcome to his disciples, all other has this use in it that it spreads the knowledge of what is opposed, and prompts the more thoughtful to inquiry. On the whole, then, the period has not been lost as far as Comte's personal recognition is in question, though it were useless to deny that it has been below what we could have hoped or wished. We must not forget, however, how silent is the growth of great influences, how at a given period, without any warning, their penetration becomes apparent, and the name which was a byword stands pre-eminent in honour.

It has not been lost either for his doctrine, if we can by an effort separate it from himself. We can see, I think, that some wish to do this, to accept the benefit and repudiate the author. This is perceptible in more than one writer of

present repute. There is no ground for anxiety on this point. It may be asserted confidently that, at the close of our period, one conclusion at any rate has been reached by all who have studied the subject, the conclusion, viz., that Comte's work is a whole, without any break in its unity, an expansion, but without any departure from the original conception. This ensures the failure of any attempt to separate the teaching from the teacher, when its triumph shall come. During the period of struggle it makes it of little importance that men take this or that portion, and partially or altogether refuse to acknowledge their obligation. It is bad for themselves, but it is not equally so for the doctrine, and such is its coherence that it will be too strong for such partial acceptance, and with full admission will come, perforce or freely, the long-begrudged recognition of the personal service.

Whatever the future may reserve for us, we cannot look back on our Positivist past and not see that there has been progress made by the doctrine, and the religion which is its highest expression. I would not exaggerate, nor would I go into any minute estimate, but content myself with a very general statement. Whether from our own personal experience, limited as that is, or from the witness of others, we know that the place which the Positive Religion holds in the general estimation is very different from what it was, that Positivism is acknowledged to be a real social force. It is not so much that in any one centre or quarter it is strong or stronger, at least that is not the point which strikes me in regard to its growth. It is rather that it is constantly appearing in new quarters, often the most unexpected, now with the solitary thinker, now with a social bearing; that go where you will, you find some one or more who are attending to it, and asking themselves what is the worth of it; if not accepting it themselves, yet by their tolerance and respect making it easier for others to accept it. In no country of what we proudly call the civilised world is it unknown, and this of itself is much, considering the separation that exists by language and mutual jealousies between the various constituents of that world. There is a certain expectation attaching to the new faith which explains this its wide spread in so short a time, and that when it rests on no powerful

external support, so that wherever men are thoughtfully and distrustfully regarding the future they are led to inquire what it offers. It is most difficult to trace the process by which it spreads, but it is clear that it has some real growing force in it from its intimate connection with the needs of our time, so that the least occasion is enough for it. I will add that the degree of preparation for it is much greater than we at first think.*

I repeat that I am anxious not to overestimate its advance, or the hold it obtains where it is known and talked of; but that in the space of time it should be, in the extent above stated, known and talked of, and be met as men meet something which claims their active support and allegiance, with acceptance in some cases, with strong repugnance in others, not therefore as a mere philosophic doctrine, this is, I cannot but think, a satisfactory result, and a pledge of further increase.

We have either personal knowledge or the evidence of others to rely upon when we state that in Sweden and Norway, Holland, Germany, Italy, Spain and Portugal, Great Britain and France, both in North and South America, and in Australia, in some degree or other, attention has been given to what the Positive Religion offers, and that no amount of rejection of it is strong enough to stifle it. To this list I may add Russia and India, the last the most satisfactory indication of all, as outside the European world, and so testifying to the power of the Religion to overleap barriers which would seem in our present state almost impassable. When I speak of India I do not mean the European governors of India, but its own proper people—the Hindoos. Nor have China and Japan been without conscious contact with Positivism. It is daily becoming more apparent

* We are here fresh from a great loss—one having left us by death whom we all felt to be a source of strength from his firm faith in our religion, his firm grasp of it, and the simple, consistent beauty of his nature and his life. I may venture so much in speaking of Mr. Jones. Why I so venture at this particular point is that in my last conversation with him he made some remarks on his own experience which bear out what I have just said of the preparation for our religion. He had been, he said, in Switzerland, explaining to some one his opinions. He was told that they were Comte's. He had never heard of him before, but on coming to know him he saw how far the course of his own thought had led him in agreement with his conclusions; and so it is with others, no doubt.—[*Added at Liverpool, 17 Sept., 1882.*]

that the non-European peoples watch with interest all the changes of thought in Europe, that the strong current of human convergence gives an increase of importance to each isolated centre of growth. Let us, whilst on this point, not forget that in the judgment of its Founder it is in reference to the largest relations of men that the beneficent action of the Religion of Humanity should first approve itself, manifesting its ability to replace in its highest function the Medieval Papacy.

If from the teacher and the faith he taught we turn for a moment to ourselves, what is the general retrospect? With the conviction we have of the beauty and value of what we preach, these twenty-five years have been undoubtedly, to some among us, a weary time of slow growth under the exhausting influence, in this country at least, of many years of great isolation. The latter portion, twelve out of the twenty-five years of the period, with all its difficulties, has removed this isolation, if it still leaves our numbers but small. But from the whole period, in spite of all drawbacks, we emerge with the consciousness that some real advance has been achieved, that we are far from being where we were at its beginning. This is true of our direct, still more true if we consider our indirect influence. I enter into no personal questions. I deal with the whole body of Auguste Comte's disciples who adopt, in some sense or other, the Religion he founded, and take a retrospect of the whole of their action since he left us, and with all confidence affirm that that Religion stands before the world in a different and higher position than it did, without one further word as to the source of this improvement than this, that it is mainly to be referred to the intrinsic strength of the truth we proclaim. In that strength lies our confidence for the future. Be our weakness, our shortcomings, what they may, they may retard, they cannot prevent its gradual but uninterrupted triumph; they will, I doubt not, themselves largely diminish under its invigorating influence. In the same confidence we can watch without alarm any divisions either in judgment or in action which our beginnings, in strict accordance with all prior experience, may have seen or may see. Even now, imperfect as we are in the faith and

at a very early stage, we may verify the power there is in the doctrine to overbear differences, and in its essential unity to enforce practical co-operation. Any such power is not likely to become weaker as we move forwards. The nature of our task, the greatness of the effort it demands, the vastness of the interests it involves, all tend the same way. Perfect smoothness in the working were beyond our hope, but the pressure of a supreme urgency is upon us, drawn from the instinctive demand of man for a new and stable order, and we shall learn to disregard, if we cannot cease to feel, the friction.

Any allusion to ourselves is, however, but an episode. I return to my one real subject, Auguste Comte, and after this retrospective treatment, I would ask you to consider not now his teaching so much as the strength we may gain from his example, from special communion with him; communion of the same kind as we are wont to have with other great types—with St. Paul, for instance, or with Dante—with Shakespeare, or with Milton. I select one or two points as useful. I have spoken of the strain put upon our endurance by our slow rate of progress. We cannot but feel it, and all the more because we know that it is a very powerful, if not the most powerful argument which keeps many from joining us. In our hour of least resistance to the pressure, of greatest impatience, we may recur to the long endurance of Comte, the thirty-five years during which he was working without ceasing, for the most part without any encouragement, amid dislike and opposition, and latterly in the presence of real want. Shall we not follow as we have been led?

There are times, too, of another form of discouragement. We see that all around us reject what we offer, sometimes with anger, often with contempt, more often with the quietest indifference. We ask ourselves, Can it be that we are deceived, that the whole is an illusion? There can be, I feel sure, no more satisfactory answer to this misgiving than a quiet study of that master intellect year after year advancing to a firmer conviction of the truth of the great scheme he was elaborating. Or again, we long for the support given by the belief of others in what we believe. From his letters to Mill we may see how much Comte

longed for it. We have it in far larger amount than he had ; as far as intellectual assent to the leading features of our doctrine is concerned, we have it in abundance. So that we have no excuse as his disciples for doubt or discouragement.

Again, in an age when both States and Individuals profess as their guiding principle the doctrine of self-interest, a life such as Comte's, of entire devotion to the welfare of others, a life, too, passed in the same atmosphere which we breathe, and therefore directly in kinship with our own circumstances, continues and greatly strengthens the influence of similar saintly lives in the past, showing that such saintly life is not a thing of the past, but one of our own time as much as any other. The most beautiful of all spectacles, to use his own words, a great intellect consecrated to the advancement of the general welfare, was seen in his case in all its perfection. It rebukes our feebleness, and appeals to whatever of latent strength we may yet retain.

In speaking of our age as one of prevailing self-interest, I would not overstate or misstate the case by ignoring its better side. All who will examine for themselves must see that there is a better side, that there is a large and increasing movement in the other direction, often wanting a wise guidance, at times, perhaps, ill-directed, but none the less manifesting a recoil from the predominant impulse, a complete devotion to the common good at almost any cost to self. We should be clear of all exclusiveness, and freely recognise and honour the goodness we see around us, though it be not formally with us. These remarks, I may add, apply equally to all practical efforts, whether they be alien to all definite religious systems, or the accompaniment and fruit of some form of religious belief.

Again, under another aspect, we may study Auguste Comte's life with advantage. His consciousness of his services and the claims resting on them, of his great achievements, which were to him what the Sacred Poem was to Dante, the Koran to Mohammed, his missionary labours to St. Paul ; this consciousness, I say, and its free expression, are often commented on and thought to justify repulsion. For him, as for the others whom I have instanced, the judgment must lie with the ages that follow

them, when the justice of the claim may be more calmly weighed. I myself have no doubt of its justice. It has not been sufficiently remarked, I may here say, that there is a change in Comte's language in this respect, that he became less directly personal in his assertion, and ever more inclined to place the merit of his achievement outside of himself, to transfer it to another. Not to himself, in the well-known passage in which he claims to have had the career of St. Paul as well as that of Aristotle, does he ascribe this result, but to the influence upon him of Madame de Vaux, to an external inspiration consequently. So again in the final invocation, which is of such capital importance in regard to his whole work, we have the freest admission of the same influence, without which step after step in his vast religious construction would have been missed. Any excess of his personality disappears in his reverent love.

This remark introduces and illustrates the aspect which I wished to mention, that of the moral rising of his whole being, the constant endeavour, more visibly successful in his later years, by prayer and discipline, to reach his own high ideal. This endeavour is the characteristic of genuine humility; it is the practical expression of the strong sense of imperfection which is of little value if it acquiesces in the actual attainment. On this side Comte must yet wait for the juster judgment which will follow from more full knowledge. But already, from his own writings, as from the testimony of others, enough is known to warrant what I have said. If we are self-contented, and averse to the means by which in all recent ages men have evidenced their desire for a growth in goodness, we can at least claim no sanction from the example of our teacher. With the great religious minds of all ages, he saw in the culture of his moral nature, in the exercises of devotion in the common sense of the words, the source of renewed strength, a wellspring of higher inspirations.

Let us distinguish for a moment. To do great things there must be a consciousness of great power, and when the things have been done, he who has exerted that power cannot be blind to the results achieved. His work is there; he can judge it, he speaks truly of it, and in speaking truly he speaks

highly of it. It were unworthy of him not to do so. But neither the worker nor the work is the whole man. And when from the true judgment of the work, the man brings equal truth to bear upon himself, then his language and his feeling are different. I have more than once mentioned Dante. None can think he had an inadequate sense of what he had done. But it is equally true that none can think that, when his own nature and conduct are in question, Dante is wanting in the most genuine insight, and as its consequence, in the truest humility. This distinction I urge as applicable to Auguste Comte. He knew what he had done ; he knew also what he was.

I have said enough for my object. That object has been on this, as on other occasions, to place ourselves in direct communion with our Master, and to show that Auguste Comte is not merely the great thinker and teacher, but also a great exemplar by virtue of a noble life—a life of courage, of endurance, of devotion to the service of his kind, of self-sacrificing love—whilst I have throughout remembered what I began with, that we are commemorating a purely human being, the greatest, if only by his position,—by the peculiar lot which fell to him to reveal Her,—of the servants of Humanity, but still a servant of Humanity, one of whom we are fellow-servants. No one has more justly and ungrudgingly allowed the services of others. As successive generations of his disciples pass, they will see that he meets with the same unstinted justice himself. We cannot secure it for him at present, yet we can do something towards it, and what we can do should be done. It is not a light evil, the injustice done to any eminent servant of the race, though from its being the portion of so many such, one might almost say of all, we have got to think little of it. Injustice to the dead is the withholding of the veneration they have deserved. We who believe that the weakening of veneration is the crying moral evil of our time, may at least see that we do not fail in it as regards our Master. That it is due I know we feel.

CONCLUDING PRAYER.

We praise thee, Humanity, as for all thy great servants, so more especially on this day devoted to his memory, for thy greatest servant, Auguste Comte, through whose teaching Thou standest revealed to all future generations as the source to man of all the good which through long ages of effort and suffering he has attained, and as the power by which throughout the rest of his existence on earth he may increase that good; and we pray that in proof of our gratitude we may become thy more willing and complete servants; that, guided by his teaching and influenced by his example, we may consecrate our lives more wholly to the carrying forward the work for which he lived—the attainment by man of that unity which has been the aspiration of all thy noblest saints, but which he alone has taught us how to reach. In his name, and through him, we praise and magnify thee as the Queen of our devotion, the Lady of our loving service, the one centre of all our being, the one bond of all the ages, the one shelter for all the families of mankind, the one foundation of a truly Catholic Church. To thee be all honour and glory. Amen.

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE

CHURCH OF HUMANITY, 19 Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C.,

On the 25th Anniversary of Auguste Comte's death, 24 Gutenberg 94

(5 September, 1882).

*COMMEMORATION OF THE BIRTHDAY OF
AUGUSTE COMTE.*

19th January, 1798.

19 Moses, 102 (Sunday, 19th January, 1890).

As an introduction to the commemorative service of to-day I begin with an act of general commemoration, as I shall end it with a more particular commemoration, the combination of the two giving a unity to the whole of what I say. It may also set all in proper proportion, reminding us that, as Comte has taught us, Humanity is greater than any of her organs.

In the name of the Past, in the interest of the Future, we of the Present commemorate with veneration and gratitude the services of the successive generations of men—the services which have raised Humanity, under her own constant impulse, from her original weakness to her actual power. We offer her our due homage for the achievements of her fetichistic infancy, the capital acquisitions on which her whole advance has been founded, the basis of the order established in her theocratic childhood. That theocratic childhood, we must remember, is the period to the honour of which the present month is devoted. As is then fitting in such a month, we recall the eminent representatives of theocracy, fetichistic, polytheistic, and monotheistic, Moses and those who stand next to him; more particularly in this week we name with profound respect the theocratic order of China, Thibet, Japan, Peru, and Oceania, under the special invocation of Confucius. Under all its forms this order deserves our tribute as the earliest and hitherto the completest discipline of man, the satisfaction for the time of all the wants of his nature.

As members of a Western branch of the Church of Humanity we recall with reverence the efforts of our direct forefathers during the partial transitions from that first

complete order, under the Gods, or God, to the final and still more complete and stable order in Humanity. And herein we commemorate the religious guidance of the West under St. Paul resting on Moses—its esthetic culture typified by Homer, Dante, and Shakespeare; its philosophic grasp of the whole range of man's conceptions, as exemplified in Aristotle and Descartes with Leibnitz; its long and difficult building up of the scientific foundation, a construction represented by Archimedes and Bichat; its anticipation of the direction of the Future in its industrial development, the type of which we find in Gutenberg; lastly, the shelter and security gained for all these labours by the genius of the Western statesmen, pre-eminent among whom are Cæsar, Charlemagne and Frederic—honouring throughout and in all the Being, the Humanity, who has spoken through them and whose organs they have been in her partial manifestations, through whose constant co-operation alone their labours have been fruitful.

My reason for offering to take on me the service of to-day was that I stand in a peculiar relation to him who is its special object. No living Englishman was in so much personal connection with him, nor had any so direct a commission from him. I regret that I did not see more of him, that I did not use more fully the opportunities there were for intercourse by letters. But that depended on my circumstances at the time, on which I need not now enter.

When after his death the question arose what should be done to carry on his religious work and to perpetuate by some social institutions his action, M. Laffitte, as our *interim* director, named, as the two festivals which might associate all Positivists, Auguste Comte's birthday and the day of his death. And for some few years this was the plan followed. Those two days were the only two days of general meeting. So the two sermons with which in 1859 and 1860 I began in this country the preaching of the Religion of Humanity were delivered on the 19th of the first month of the year. Then I proposed that we should keep the Festival of Humanity, as completely opportune, and as so considered by Auguste Comte.

We know from his *Confessions* that he looked on this Festival as inaugurated by the meeting of his disciples at his house, in order to testify their respect, on the 1st of the year. In principle such tribute to him was a beginning of the practice, if there were defects, as he felt there were defects, in the form which it took at first. There seemed then sufficient reason for proclaiming distinctly and by an outward act the New Religion, a reason for continuing a practice which had such a sanction, and which bore directly on the Religion,—was not bound up with its author. The largest possible honour should be paid him, but it was not to be wished that our religious action should be limited to a personal commemoration. We had to assert the existence of a new Faith, to affirm it in presence of an indifferent or hostile society, and if we restricted ourselves to the tribute to Comte himself we were in danger of obscuring the Being, the Humanity he had revealed, in danger of merging the foundation in the founder. The proposal made on such grounds was accepted, and since its acceptance, since the consequent transfer of the meeting from the 19th January to the 1st, there has been no break in the celebration of our highest Festival, which is the direct recognition of the Power we serve. By this transfer the strictly personal commemoration of our Founder and Master has been till very recently confined to the day of his death.

The change having been made, and the objection above mentioned obviated, the earlier practice may be resumed. It has been resumed in Paris. There is good and sufficient reason for so doing there, and if there, here also. In all that is possible and so far as their action is sound, we here should, I imagine, all of us be glad to act in agreement with our co-religionists, however much we may disapprove their attitude. When it is a question of an additional act of honour to Auguste Comte, there can be no division in principle between us, if the particular form chosen be one which we can hardly accept; and I confess to not liking the proposal for this evening's meeting in Paris. There has certainly been no disposition to excess of personal recognition. And as in our advance the worship of Humanity has taken its due relative prominence and, be the form as imperfect as you will, is an unquestioned fact for all who care to observe what is done by

us as believers, we may gladly restore the observance of this day. It offers an occasion, in the early part of the year, for the expression of our gratitude and veneration, whilst at the same time as occurring in the month of Humanity it brings his subjective existence, his memory, his composite memory, if I may be allowed the term, into close relation with the Being to whose service he devoted his life, whose most powerful organ he must for ever be. There is also a further advantage in keeping this day, in one way or another, as a day marked by a great memory, in that it gives us a festival in connection with that memory which is apart from the sadder associations which are inseparable at present, perhaps always will be inseparable, from the September commemoration. A general tone which has always seemed to me unbecoming on the later day may be fitting enough for the earlier. I say a general tone, for there would still be a necessity for a very careful consideration of the details, for weighing them in relation to the substance of the work we have to do.

In other years, it seems to me that the most simple, and therefore in our present condition the best, form of celebrating this birthday of our Master would be a social meeting with something rather special in its character, something which might make it sufficiently distinct from our ordinary social meetings. This would be not difficult to devise. For this year, in the meantime, as the day falls on a Sunday, it was easy to make our usual morning meeting speak more distinctly of him.

There is naturally connected with a birthday more of hope, of cheerfulness, of promise, and we may avail ourselves of this natural connection to view Auguste Comte's life under a brighter aspect, to the exclusion of regret; dwelling on the great results attained, on the execution in maturity of the thought of youth. In so treating my subject, however, I shall not linger on the early days of Comte, on his early intellectual development, on his then relations to his noble and tender mother, on his complete subjection to the revolutionary spirit and consequent alienation from the Catholic influences of his home, on the mixed and turbid character in short of his earlier life, whether at Montpellier

or in Paris. Scattered up and down in the various writings we possess we have given us the means for understanding his first life and its results, above all for seeing how he judged it and them in the full force of his later years. Nor again shall I linger on his early writings, nor on his laborious philosophic construction, which he judged to have unduly absorbed attention, nor lastly on the coincidence of the termination of that effort with the close of his unhappy marriage by the voluntary act of the wife, so that he recovered at one and the same time his personal freedom and the freedom to turn his intellectual powers to another task. I pass over also the two works which were the fruits of the interval of repose thus tardily gained and so keenly enjoyed. I would rather on this occasion, it will find us materials enough, centre our attention on his second, his true life, that which he wished to be the ground of any judgment. It gave, we can see, a different colour to his former existence, it took up again the better elements of that former existence, turning only from that which he deplored. Freely treated, it will be found to introduce unity into the whole, and to strengthen the continuity of the whole. I shall attempt no minuteness of detail, I would rather state in the simplest strongest form the broad leading principles of the method to be adopted if we would understand Comte's real life, that in which he used all his previous exertions and acquisitions as a foundation for work done under more propitious conditions, and under a higher inspiration.

It was, as it were, a second birth, this entry into a new life under the guidance of his love. She whom he loved was for him a mother in the highest sense, for he owed to her new powers, a new being; through her he became capable of the highest perfection which he could attain, a perfection which was in constant advance; he owed to her his regeneration morally, the enlargement of his intellect, the ennobling of his actions, the complete unity of his private and public life which had previously been so sadly disjoined. Madame Clotilde de Vaux was in a word, and that word taken from older language, his illumination. *Domina illuminatio mea*. No thought, no feeling, but was

brought under her sway. His whole being responded to her holy influence, an influence purified, intensified, and made paramount by death. All that in the various relations of the family life woman can be to man, all that in those relations is ordinarily represented by different persons, she embodied in herself. She was not merely the one guardian angel in whom all the types of that creation, or rather that adoption and consecration, were united, but she was also to him his patroness, his exemplar, his superior, the representative for him of the Humanity they served in common.

The true way, I conceive, for arriving at a right understanding of his attitude towards Clotilde de Vaux, if we have any difficulty which is not removed by the study of his *Confessions*, justly placed as the highest form of sacred poetry, would be to look to other similar cases. There are two within our reach: the relation of Dante to Beatrice which is becoming more and more familiar to English thought almost with each year, and the relation of Petrarch to Laura. The two great poets have won acceptance with mankind. Their tributes ever repeated, yet ever varying and fresh, startle no one, are taxed as exaggerations by none. Time has consecrated them more fully no doubt, but their beauty and their justice have never been questioned, they have been an honour to their objects, an honour to those who have offered them. They grow in force with each generation, as in the progress of Humanity the reverence for her representatives, for those who transmit her influence, gains a firmer hold on the general conceptions of mankind. There are other precedents, one possibly more conclusive, for the adoring love of Auguste Comte, but I content myself with the two instanced, as the least likely to raise opposition. Let us in the light of such precedents carry our view onwards, and anticipate the sanction of time. To disciples that should be easy and pleasant. Let us give Comte's tribute the force with which it will gradually invest itself and use it to strengthen and add precision to all the vaguer ideas and tendencies which are around us in the direction I have mentioned, namely, the just and full estimate of, the reverence for, women as the representatives of Humanity, the channels of her grace to men.

In stating as forcibly as I can the light in which Comte saw his noble Patroness, I should add before I go farther that there was no exclusiveness attaching to his worship of her, this worship, in his own words, of gratitude and of love, of eternal respect and of affection. It gave, I said above, unity to his life. It restored him his childhood and its influences. It threw him back on his earliest associations, on the memory of the mother to whom he owed his loving nature. It revived that memory as an object of his worship, it gave new force to his feelings as a son. His mother's venerated image came into ever closer combination with that of Clotilde de Vaux. In prayer and confession the two are in closest union. So he reconstituted in the light and power of his later love the chain of the years.

Nor was this all. Aided by his chief angel herself, with her full assent, he associated the third member of the group, his adopted daughter, her welcome sister. So little was there of any tendency to narrow the range of his best feelings by an exclusive concentration on one all-absorbing object. His central love acted in quite a contrary direction. We find him always disposed to increase his family by additions taken from new and old friends, as also by a keen participation in the interests of all the families with which his life and teaching brought him into connection.

I do not know how far we realise the extent to which Comte carried his acknowledgment of Madame de Vaux's influence and benefits. We are all familiar with the preface to the *Catechism* and its explanation of the choice of her as the catechumen in the dialogue. Perhaps it is an effect of our multifarious and hasty reading that we do not penetrate deeply enough into the sense of the really great thinkers. Such reading as used to be given to the Bible and as is still given by many, or to the Koran, or to other sacred books by devout believers, such reading as is now given by thoughtful students to the greatest poets when our object is to draw out the minutest shade of the meaning, to see the full force of each word and phrase, such reading as that is rare. Yet it is the kind of reading which we should bring to the study of one whose writing is so instinct with depth of conviction and of purpose. It is too often the case that as we read such

passages as that above mentioned, we understand its general statement, accept it, and pass on without seeing all that it implies. It would leave many, I doubt not, unprepared for the language of the *Confessions* where he speaks to her of the *Catechism* as *our* catechism, our joint work, that is, not my work in fact with you as a disciple, but your work expressed by and through me. So again in the final invocation which forms the close of his principal work, the *Positive Politics*, parts of which you have heard this morning, whilst we cannot mistake the general bearing of the language used, we may easily not feel it in its full force; we may pass too lightly over the unhesitating attribution to his Patroness and Exemplar of the leading part in his great religious construction.

Again this is not all. His advance in religious conceptions was intimately bound up with his moral progress. And in relation to this we may reflect on the meaning of such words as end the seventh Confession. 'I should not be a worthy Pontiff of Humanity were I not profoundly convinced of my moral inferiority to thee. It is then the endeavour to be like thee to which I must more and more cling. Not ceasing to be my true wife, thou wilt become more especially my sainted Patroness, and in an increasing degree the source of my best progress.' The judgment is most distinct as to the position he assigned her in the work he accomplished, and in that which he meditated.

It is only for form's sake necessary on this occasion to remind ourselves of what that work was. In him it was the re-organisation of human existence, by the setting it forth in its continuous unity, by explaining in due order all the conceptions which belong to it throughout its three inseparable constituents, the Past, the Future, and the Present. It was the institution of the new religion, a religion agreeing in kind, in its essential idea of unity, with all religions, but attaining to that idea in supreme degree. This was the work of the *Politics* and of the two smaller works which range with the *Politics*. With unexhausted brain, with unfaltering courage, with a vision ever enlarging in its comprehensive intuitions he moved on to the succeeding work, but the first step only was taken. The two others were denied him by death, as was the accomplishment of his

latest hope. He did not live to write the exposition of the *First Philosophy* nor the intermediate and lighter tasks, such as his work on Paris, the biography of Madame de Vaux, and his autobiography. To-day I have, however, only to mention these, whilst emphasizing the great achievements.

What he effected is, as we view it, and as we may more confidently each year see that it will be viewed, a change in the whole direction of Humanity, a sufficient light for our practical guidance thrown on her whole future course. The light thrown will enable her, through the ministration of those who accept it in each generation, to move with sure steps, as aware of the conditions under which she moves, seeing both the point of her departure and the terminus towards which she directs her course. Such clear-sightedness is invaluable in all the ordinary conduct of life, it will not be otherwise in this largest domain of human conduct. It has never before been the lot of man. He has lived under definite laws but he has not known them,—he now may know them. He has felt towards the goal,—he now sees it. The difference is quite incalculable, and the gain it constitutes is the sure warrant of an increased rate of advance, with less of waste, less of needless friction, less consequently of human suffering and bitterness. I would in nothing exaggerate; but Comte's labour has brightened the whole outlook of Humanity.

I have said enough of the outward results and their inspiration. I would now touch on the unity established in his life, the identification of his public and private existence. It had been so far otherwise with him. He had found in his public labours, it is true, a compensation for his private jars and sorrows, but this private suffering had weighed down his energies and delayed his work. Now on the contrary all concurred to further it. Motive and thought and expression, all felt the strong stimulus of a being moving altogether, day by day reaching a more stable harmony. In the troubled environment in which we live, in the discord of opinions and feelings which we cannot wholly escape, this blessing of inward peace is rare, ceases at times to be even desired by many. The means of its attainment are never thought of, or if mentioned are scorned. It must be to all his disciples a

source of true pleasure to think that Comte attained such peace; that the outwardly sad and lonely life on which observers commented, now with mere astonishment, now with admiration, was warmed and irradiated from within, till it rivalled, in the completeness of its triumph over all that was adverse, the victory achieved by the saintliest of his predecessors.

And in the innermost sphere of personality what was the effect and aim of this his second life? Comte rested not in the expression either of his feelings or his intellect,—in the gratification of his loving devotion, or in the utterances which were to serve his race. He laboured hard and incessantly at his own moral improvement. ‘This worship,’ he says, ‘of gratitude and love which can never cease to solace, nor above all to make me better.’ *To make him better*, the thought was always before him. In genuine humility he felt his need. By every form of self-discipline which a sound reason could suggest he sought to purify and raise his nature and his action. Again I would insist on the obligation of interpreting him by this second life, throwing back its light on the first. So judged, that first life becomes the period of probation, of growth, of the acquisition of experience, of fall and rise, with evil in it, but evil which was to pass, the evil of personal weakness and of social imperfection, evil which for us and our successors has in the final issue been turned into a source of highest gains.

In all the struggle, veneration and tenderness had remained with him. They had wanted their due food, and his life had suffered from the want. But at length it was supplied, and the expansion was rapid and decisive. The whole nature responded to the demand.

We have as his disciples suffered much from the unavoidable delay in the revelation of our Master’s inner life. Now that it has been made, it will work gradually upon us. I have drawn upon it only so far in what I have said as might explain and, I hope, justify the way I have treated this day’s tribute, wherein I have not been thinking or speaking of his birthday in the ordinary sense, but have passed on to his second birth, his birth into his true life, of which the first was but a necessary condition. The mere keeping of a birth-

day even of the most eminent of the servants of Humanity were but a slight object, but we may make it an occasion for something of much greater importance. In this case it may serve to remind us of the benefits we have received and of the source and origin of those benefits—their source partly in a commanding genius working under a strong social impulse—their source more largely in a noble and loving nature, acting in submission to the inspiration of the truest affection, and by such submission enabled to put aside every obstacle, to arrest within himself and put down for others the insurrection of the intellectual powers, whilst by their wise subordination to the moral faculties he gave them greater vigour. The supremacy of the heart over the intellect—in this constantly asserted principle lies the condensation of Positivism, the foundation of the Religion of Humanity.

In accordance with the commemorative act which began my discourse, in accordance with the results attained partly by the social impulse of his earlier life, and with the still greater achievements of the second life under the inspiration of as deep a human love as we have anywhere recorded, enclosing what I have said between a general and a particular commemoration, which, well examined, are found in closest, most inseparable connection, I would, reversing the order of the beginning, recall to you the complete identification of Auguste Comte with the Provisional Calendar he has formed for us.

In the roll of statesmen and rulers he takes no place, yet he has explained their function and their continuance for a time, with the conditions under which they are to continue, if competent. He has judged and placed them. His conception must more and more constitute their guidance. So for the industrial direction, which is the substitute ultimately for government as at present, he has clearly pointed out its intellectual value in the past, its practical efficacy in the future, as the expression of the highest form of man's direct action. The series of scientific labours and labourers finds its natural completion in him.

By the creation of sociology and morals, by the ranging these two strictly human sciences under the same method as the earlier, and consequently by the finishing of the whole construction, he justly stands third in the order which comprises Archimedes and Bichat. So for the philosophy of the race he is the complement of Aristotle, and of the two modern philosophers Descartes and Leibnitz. If poetry be taken in its rightful extension as the constructive power of which poetry in the more restricted sense is one and a very high manifestation, then apart from Comte's own inchoate poetic conception, he stands in no distant relation to the supreme artists of the world. His vision of Man's past and future is a poetic effort of a higher order than Dante's even. Human life becomes a poem through him. Lastly, for us and gradually for others, he takes an unquestioned supremacy in the list of religious teachers. Greater than Mohammed, were it only by virtue of a more complete transmission of the Western tradition, in fuller unison, that is, with the most forward of human movements, he is greater than St. Paul by virtue of the inheritance of St. Paul, an inheritance which has been worked out by the intervening centuries of Christian history, greater also as the more direct organ of Humanity, as her more competent interpreter therefore, and as such able to set aside any limitations which hampered the noble catholicism of the great Apostle. It is but fitting that he who has put before man the claims of others should have his own claims duly honoured, as the simplest consequence of an attentive study of his work.

DANTE.—PURGATORY.—CANTO XXX. I—38.

Soon as that polar light, fair ornament
Of the first heaven, which hath never known
Setting nor rising, nor the shadowy veil
Of other cloud than sin, to duty there
Each one conveying, as that lower doth
The steersman to his port, stood firmly fix'd;
Forthwith the saintly tribe, who in the van
Between the Gryphon and its radiance came,
Did turn them to the car, as to their rest:
And one, as if commission'd from above,
In holy chant thrice shouted forth aloud;

"Come, spouse! from Libanus": and all the rest
 Took up the song.— At the last audit, so
 The blest shall rise, from forth his cavern each
 Uplifting lightly his new-vested flesh;
 As, on the sacred litter, at the voice
 Authoritative of that elder, sprang
 A hundred ministers and messengers
 Of life eternal. "Blessed thou who comest!"
 And, "Oh!" they cried, "from full hands scatter ye
 Unwithering lilies": and, so saying, cast
 Flowers over head and round them on all sides.
 I have beheld, ere now, at break of day,
 The eastern clime all roseate; and the sky
 Opposed, one deep and beautiful serene;
 And the sun's face so shaded, and with mist
 Attemper'd, at his rising, that the eye
 Long while endured the sight: thus, in a cloud
 Of flowers, that from those hands angelic rose,
 And down within and outside of the car
 Fell showering, in white veil with olive wreathed,
 A virgin in my view appear'd, beneath
 Green mantle, robed in hue of living flame:
 And o'er my spirit, that so long a time
 Had from her presence felt no shuddering dread,
 Albeit mine eyes discern'd her not, there moved
 A hidden virtue from her, at whose touch
 The power of ancient love was strong within me.

CHURCH OF HUMANITY, 19 Chapel Street, Lamb's Conduit Street

THE SACRAMENT OF INCORPORATION.

THE IXTH SACRAMENT

OF THE

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

THE INCORPORATION

OF

JAMES CRUICKSHANK GEDDES.

22ND FREDERIC, 99

(Saturday, 26th November, 1887).

TO HIS WIDOW,
EMILY GEDDES,
WHO SHARED AND INSPIRED HIS CONVICTIONS,
HIS SACRIFICES, HIS SERVICE,
WHO CONTINUES HIS LIFE WITH LOVING DEVOTION,
BY THE COURAGEOUS
FULFILMENT OF ALL DUTIES, .
WITH A NOBLE ENDURANCE OF ILL-HEALTH,
OF SORROW, OF BEREAVEMENT.

INVOCATION.

IN THE NAME OF HUMANITY.

LOVE FOR PRINCIPLE AND

ORDER FOR BASIS;

PROGRESS FOR END.

LIVE FOR OTHERS.

LIVE OPENLY.

Reading from the Imitation of Christ, Bk. II. ch. 4.

General Prayer for the Sacraments.

GRACIOUS POWER, in whose name and by whose inspiration, in dutiful obedience to thy Past, thy great Servant and Interpreter, Auguste Comte, giving full expression to the earlier instinctive aspirations of man, and completing what was defective in their later satisfaction, has instituted for thy church a ninefold series of sacraments, which in their whole sequence and right use, as in other days will be seen, will bind the family union to the social, and link in close connection the successive generations of mankind, thus forming to order and beauty our otherwise imperfectly ordered existence, strengthening our union, imparting unity to our individual life, and drawing forth into more vivid consciousness our social continuity: may we thy servants here met for the administration of one of the series, the final Sacrament of INCORPORATION, bring home to ourselves by meditation the benefits of this institution, opening our lives to the influence of the conception and so evidencing our gratitude for all that we have received, manifesting the power

BBB

of our faith to our mutual support and to the glorifying of thy name, and thereby furthering that in which alone the trouble of the race can find its end : the religious unity which nothing but thy advent, Humanity, can offer to all thy children. Amen.

ADDRESS.

The Sacraments of the Religion of Humanity are closely interwoven with the whole of its educational system. Their full treatment would have found therefore its natural place in the treatise on Practical Morals, which Auguste Comte did not live to write ; we have but the plan of it. He has left us, however, an outline of these Sacraments. Both in the *Catechism* and in the *Positive Politics* (Vol. IV.) we find their institution. We have to do what we can, gradually perfecting the institution, or rather, the administration, under the guidance of his very definite indications.

The full significance of our Sacraments can only be realised at present by much thought ; it will become plainer as the new church grows and spreads. Yet even now few parts of our religion are as much appreciated as these consecrations—these social sanctions. As one after another they are sought and administered, we attain a better perception of their guiding power ; they lose their theoretic difficulties and manifest their practical utility. For a just estimate of them we must look to the gradual growth of our social feelings. This is especially true of the Sacrament we celebrate to-day.

Life is a series of preparations, gradual steps in the process of connecting the individual existence with Humanity, the ultimate object being our incorporation into Humanity when our service has been worthily rendered, our preparation duly completed. The Sacrament then which proclaims that incorporation accomplished perfects the series and rightly takes the name it bears. The idea of incorporation runs through the whole Sacramental theory, the Christian theory no less than our own. Thus, in the Baptismal service of the Church of England we have the words : Incorporate into thy Holy Church.

Now what is this Sacrament of Incorporation which we to-day celebrate for the first time in England? Implicitly, our commemoration of Dwarka Nath Mitter seven years after his death was an incorporation, but it did not take the exact form. It is the last of the nine sacraments of the Religion of Humanity—the final consecration. It differs from the others in its being concerned with the period after death—with the subjective life. The others are all connected with life in the ordinary sense, this our mortal life, and as such are objective. It perfects the series of the Positive Sacraments—our social consecration of the successive epochs of our existence. It has its roots deep in the past. It rests on the instincts of man's nature, which do not sever the dead from the living. The burial of his dead is peculiar to man. As social life grew other wants came, the influence of the dead on the living was recognised. So it was that the theocratic period instituted a formal judgment of the dead in some cases. We trace in this judgment the far-distant germ of our present ceremony. The process was carried on by the apotheosis of the military civilisation, however partial its application. It was continued in the Christian Church, primitive and medieval, by the institution of saintship and canonisation, becoming more and more valuable as a social and religious influence. Not less but more than the old must the new faith dwell on this after-influence of a right life, availing itself of the judgment to spread true conceptions of the action and character it demands, availing itself of the example to stimulate the living to rise to such demands.

In its general relation to the Sacraments which have preceded it, this particular Sacrament is an evidence that they have answered their purpose, that the one persistent direction of life has not failed, that the training has resulted in the formation of an organ of Humanity.

As such it takes us back along the connected efforts of the life to which it refers, till we reach the earliest link in the chain—the Sacrament of Presentation, the initial ceremony by which the unconscious infant was engrafted into the Church, was presented in hope to Humanity to be trained for her service, to be disciplined by that service, and

qualified, when active service should be over, for the new form when the unit swells the sum total of her past servants, and adds its influence as the result of a life of devotion. Connecting Incorporation with that earliest Sacrament—there is seen to be a strong analogy between them—we may look on it as a Presentation. The Sacrament which bears this name is the Presentation to Humanity of a life to be lived, of a hope, of a service to be performed. This last Sacrament of the series is the Presentation to Humanity, not of a hope but of an achievement, of a result, of a life that has been lived, of a service accomplished. As such it is the introduction of a new element into the collective Past, a new subjective life into one of the two subjective constituents of Humanity, our Priority. So regarded, contrasting them somewhat more fully, we may say that the whole existence, past and future, lies before us in the idea of this Sacrament, a consecration from which the existence derives unity, has its just importance given to it, has its correct interpretation assigned.

Incorporation is to be a deliberate act; the solemn judgment is not to be given under the immediate impression of death. Seven years are to pass so that the disturbing passions may have been quieted, on whichever side they act, whether for or against, in either case equally interfering with a calm and just judgment. The period is enough for reflection—not long enough for the grounds of the judgment to have become obscure, or the documents lost on which it is founded.

It is to be a voluntary act—none, that is, need be subject to the decision if he prefers not. Perfect liberty is allowed here even more than in any other case. The consecration is to be asked for by its object when receiving the Sacrament of Transformation, and the wish expressed is to receive the sanction of his family. This last provision is in accordance with our conception of the Sacrament as essentially a part of the domestic worship, and it is an additional security for caution.

The ceremonial of Incorporation, when circumstances shall allow of it, is to consist in the final entombment. The first or provisional burial is a municipal or civil act, not

concerning the priesthood. It is the depositing the body in the midst of his fellow-citizens whatever be the form of burial, whatever the disposition adopted for the mortal remains. So again, the first commemoration—that which takes place on the third Sunday after death—an interval which allows the first poignancy of grief to expend itself—has a provisional character: it is the expression of our common human feelings under a loss.

If the judgment which has been asked for is favourable it will be pronounced before the bier, and the body will be transferred to the burial ground adjacent to the temple of Humanity. The degree of honour accorded will be marked by the form of monument—an inscription—a bust—a statue—such are the degrees. The memory of the dead becomes thenceforward the object of a cultus.

If the judgment be unfavourable, all that is done is to accept the first burial as final, and abstain from any mark of honour. Only in very exceptional cases will any stigma be inflicted. We need not dwell on this point now.

I am bound to add that in the second form of institution there is an additional provision for securing full maturity of judgment. A provisional decision is to be given in the fourth year after death—a decision which may be gone back upon and reversed—which serves to keep the remembrance alive and directs attention to the case, which is meant to secure its being thoroughly sifted and weighed. This provision has not been observed in the case before us. Under all the circumstances of our small Society it was not necessary. We are so few and see each other so closely.

I ought to add that Incorporation is a Sacrament directly meant for men only. For them, in the limit, it should be as universal as Presentation, but our life is such that it will never be so. Many will fall short. When given, however, it does not confine its recognition to the immediate recipient. His memory is inseparably bound up with those who have aided him by their loving service, companionship, and affection during life. The inscription on our Master's tombstone may serve for a sufficient example of what is meant.

The statement of the various features of the Sacrament

shows how much there is that we cannot have at present. As in so many other parts of our work we must, whilst we see the necessary deficiency, take into account the period of our existence and the imperfect stage of our church organisation. Here as elsewhere we must look forward—grow towards a more perfect attainment of our ideal, doing all that it is open to us to do, keeping to the principle, adding, as occasion serves, the circumstances. Certainly our imperfect state must not interfere with our discharge of the real, essential obligation. Honour, such as we can give, we must give where it is due. Those who have devoted their lives to the service of Humanity must not pass away without their due recognition, because of our weakness.

Such are the points of which I have to remind you. In our incomplete realisation of these sacramental institutions, it is right to be quite open as to any special omissions or irregularities. Therefore I notice that the judgment in the case before us was not asked for. Under the circumstances of Mr. Geddes' death, the Sacrament of *Transformation* could not take place. So it was. There could be no expressed request for the consecration of to-day. But there is sufficient justification for our action. One particular act of his life is adequate for this when rightly viewed. Several here remember his religious marriage. It is one of the associations of this room. At that marriage he gave his full assent to the inter-connection of the Sacraments. The acceptance of the one pledged him, he admitted, to the acceptance in due course of the others, and to the preparation of himself for them. None who knew him will doubt that, such as he was, he would have kept the engagement then accepted. His whole life and character are a guarantee for this. And if so, then, by implication, this special Sacrament is justly his due, and the full assent of his family where alone, so far as we are concerned, such consent is essential—ratifies this implicit demand.

I have no other point to notice. I will merely add the references to the Institution as outlined in the works of Auguste Comte: (1) *Catechism*, p. 95, 2nd Ed. (2) *Positive Politics*, Vol. IV., pp. 115, 292. In both cases the English translation is referred to.

The life of Mr. Geddes falls into two portions of nearly equal length—a period of preparation and a period of service. It is naturally the second period which is in question for us. The former, great as is its interest in this as in all cases where the life is worth attending to, calls for only a slight treatment in this Sacrament. It is the use of the preparation, not the preparation itself, that judges a man. Suffice it here if I say that the preparation was well and carefully made, under the beliefs and with the aid of the Past, skilfully applied. It was made at and near his home and with all the power of family associations to uphold him. If his circumstances were somewhat hard, characterised by privation rather than luxury, there was, on the other hand, the compensation of refinement and general respect. The help given under these general conditions was gratefully accepted; the work to be done dutifully done; the influences of affection, of culture, of discipline, rightly used, so that mentally and morally the due result was attained. The proof lies, as regards the intellect, in the success with which he passed the trial when it came; as regards the moral nature, in the deep affection which remained for all who had aided him in his preparation; as regards both intellect and heart, in the ability and character which he took with him to his special service.

That service occupies the period of early manhood, not reaching to his full maturity. On the very threshold of manhood, between twenty and twenty-one, he was placed in a highly responsible position as a member of the Indian Civil Service in Bengal. He had chosen this life without any strong predilection, without any deliberate judgment, as was natural at his age. It was the readiest opening for his self-maintenance, and afforded him the best prospect of helping his sisters. No doubts as to its nature were likely to arise in his mind, or to be suggested by his environment.

Judge it as we may, our Indian Government seems compelled to this anomaly—this government by the young. As a fact, at any rate, it takes its servants young, the exact age is under discussion, but in no case is the limit high. This early entrance on such important functions is doubtless a great strain on many, perhaps on all. But it must be allowed

in fairness that generally the strain is well borne, and that the possession of power, the sense of responsibility, the wish to answer to the confidence placed, the influence of hierarchical subordination, exert a beneficial influence on the characters and work of the majority, have an elevating effect varying in degree with what each brings with him.

Mr. Geddes brought much with him and was always found equal to the charge laid upon him. Insight and competence no doubt increased gradually as he passed from one post to another; but his great capacity and honesty of purpose were manifest from the first. In speaking of his Indian career I am necessarily thrown upon the testimony of others, but that testimony is unanimous and abundant. He rose steadily in the estimation of his official superiors as a public servant of eminent qualifications. For a time, it is true, at a later period, he was under a cloud, owing partly to his outspokenness in the criticisms of our position in India on which he ventured, partly to a misapprehension of past administrative action. But the reparation came, and though his freedom of utterance was checked his general position was unimpaired. The judgment of his superiors had the full assent of his juniors and equals—his colleagues in the service. On this point again I have ample testimony. Suffice it if I cite that of Dr. Burnell, as a name familiar to us. He several times spoke to me of Mr. Geddes' high reputation, of his marked eminence in his service, known to all the Anglo-Indian body. In fact, this general recognition of his value, of his mastery of the difficult problems of Indian administration, led to his being overtasked—to too great a strain upon his strength.

If we concentrate our attention at the outset on his professional work, we may accept the judgment passed on his performance of it. But we may also look deeper and study the spirit in which he performed it, his conception of the duties it brought with it; in a word, how far he raised it above the strict official level. It is clear that he early discovered that his position had a two-fold relation—a relation to his own government and a relation to those whom he was appointed to govern. Awake to his own direct responsibility, he was awake also to the responsibility which rested on the whole Government of which he was a member; in short, to

the full obligations of his membership. He observed, he studied, he reasoned on our intrusive action, its inherent difficulties, its anxious future. He felt the burden of Empire there for ourselves and for the peoples we govern. He examined it under all its aspects, administrative, financial, commercial. He watched the alienation of the two races, and the symptoms of danger in India and on its borders. His financial conclusions are given in his pamphlet on the logic of Indian deficit. His sympathy with the over-taxed populations, as also his sense of justice, led him to advocate a different adjustment—an adjustment which should place the cost of our most costly, often extravagant and wasteful expenditure, in larger proportion on the ruling nation, by the transfer of the Home charges to the Imperial from the Indian Budget. Naturally, as he judged more unfavourably of our position as a whole and in principle, his sympathy with the Indians increased. Much of his thought was directed to the right wielding of our power and to the alleviation of its obnoxious conditions; much also to the mode in which the connection as it now is might be brought to an end healthily for both parties. His true sympathy with the Indians was felt during his life, and is felt after his death by all in India to whom his name is known. If it embarrassed him at times in his service it has made his memory dear to them, hence the honour and affection given him.*

His conclusions, opposed to those prevalent in the service, were boldly yet temperately stated; and I know not that any servant of any government can give a higher service than he gives who, without neglect of his specific duties, contributes to the understanding by that government of its attributions and requirements, and aids in giving a right and wise direction to its policy. I am aware it is not a popular form, this form of service—not popular with the governors, but that in no way invalidates the judgment of its value.

This freer interpretation of official duty is valuable in all

* 'We must, properly speaking,' says an Indian Positivist, 'date our connection with the Positivist church from the time of Mr. Geddes. His memory in England may not extend beyond the present generation of his friends and relations. But to us here it shall always continue to have an enduring attraction, and the Sacrament endues it with a religious sanctity.'—*From 'Brahman the Priest,' by Jogendra Chandra Ghosh. Calcutta, 1888.*

cases. In the peculiar circumstances of India it is eminently required. A loyal yet not blind co-operation, which avoids absorption into mere officialism and seeks without hostility to perfect the administration from within, which secures a general openness of judgment, and obviates the danger attaching to a purely passive attitude; this would seem more requisite in that dependency than anywhere else, because of the precarious tenure on which, it is getting to be generally allowed, we hold it. It was in this spirit that Mr. Geddes gave his services; this was his understanding of his professional obligations.

The general result was, as I have stated, high esteem from his government, and the recognition by the governed of his friendliness. Their sense of his value was constantly increasing, his relations with them grew more and more cordial and equal, for his well-known general attitude was supported, as is not always the case with men's theory, by his simple, unaffected, human intercourse, which made intimacy and friendship possible. The public and the private life were in harmony with him, and the harmony had its natural effect. It conciliated without effort; social equality was recognised and without the slightest suspicion of insincerity. Under all the peculiarities of our Indian rule this is a remarkable result whenever it is achieved, and each fresh instance of such success is a great help to those who come after. The example propagates.

The result of this examination of his conduct as a Civil Servant shows that the more immediate business of his life, his special function, was well performed. Our Master often urges his disciples to be careful to make this a Positivist characteristic, bids them see that their proper professional work be done with zeal and care. To this teaching Mr. Geddes was true, and that in the largest spirit. His professional work was enlightened and ennobled by his religion, nothing was withdrawn from it as a consequence of his religious convictions, he succeeded under all the peculiar difficulties attendant on his position in harmonising his civil with his personal and domestic life.

Before I leave his Indian career there is one more point which I must not omit: it is his relation to his colleagues.

His strong sympathy with those among whom he acted as administrator or judge did not shut him off from those who stood on the same ground as himself, the members of the service to which he belonged, or others of his countrymen who were his contemporaries in India, more loosely connected than he was with the Government. I allude to such men as Mr. Lobb. For his juniors his help was always forthcoming. Remembering his own experience, he was ready to smooth the course of those who were entering on a similar career. They could count on his kind fellow-feeling and his best advice, on wise and unobtrusive counsel and impulsion to a right course. His affectionate, attractive nature, the effect of which was not impaired by want of vigour or success, gave his assistance weight and secured its grateful acceptance. To its value I have again ample testimony. And in general not merely with his juniors, but in his official environment, he made his influence felt without imposing it. There was no assumption on his part, confidence flowed to him by virtue of a rare combination of the higher qualities.

Thus from three points of view I have dealt with his special professional,—his Indian service,—and all three issue in a favourable judgment, and I rest for this judgment on the assent of competent observers. There remain two other aspects under which to regard his life's service.

It was in India that he became acquainted with Positivism, as with its judgment on the whole Indian question which lay so near to him. In that judgment he fully concurred. It was through this particular opening that he passed to the full acceptance of the Religion of Humanity, to which he gave himself without hesitation or reserve. Several can remember his earliest appearance amongst us, the fresh life and hope such an adhesion breathed into us by the mere force of his own freshness, his presence at the inauguration of this room in April, 1870, the interest he took in all the meetings which were at that time held in it, his co-operation in all our political action during the Franco-German war, his vigorous if somewhat rash and immature utterance on modern industrial life in his lecture on the month of Gutenberg. If I allow these drawbacks in reference to that lecture, I am bound to add that its warmth and the noble

spirit which pervades it have counterbalanced them, and have made it useful beyond most of our publications. And as he began so he continued throughout. His interest in all that concerned our movement never flagged. In the discussions which from time to time arose within our body, in 1872, 1877, and 1878, more particularly, he took his part with energy and yet moderation, speaking fairly and boldly and acting with decision, giving wise counsel and an example of temperate judgment. His whole Positivist life brought the cause the support of a logical and unshrinking adhesion, a strenuous and most successful effort in the propagation of the universal religion. It was a life of obedience to the precepts of his faith—a faith which by self-culture and discipline became daily more a part of his being—was better understood, more highly valued, more consistently applied.

I will appeal to one particular portion of his life for confirmation of what I have said. We owe him and not him only, but another by whom he was influenced and sustained, we owe the two, as members of the English branch of the Church of Humanity, gratitude for their courageous acceptance of the Sacrament of Marriage in all its essentials. Theirs was the first complete Positivist marriage in England—the full religious marriage as instituted by Auguste Comte. The service thus rendered was a great one, and it was rendered at a great cost and in the face of very real obstacles—in the face of that worst and most painful obstacle to a man of warm affections: disagreement with some of his own family.

In all ways his marriage was an act of true devotion and courage—most important as a precedent and encouragement. It is difficult to overrate the value of such initial steps, nor was the sequel unworthy of the beginning. The engagements then taken were most loyally fulfilled, at the cost of most painful sacrifices. There can be no greater service to a religion than a life of conformity to it, evidencing its power to direct conduct. Such evidence was given by both. All was undergone—separation, loneliness, and anxiety; nothing was allowed to interfere with the discharge of an acknowledged duty. It is impossible to honour too deeply such adherence to an accepted obligation.

For there was in the case of Mr. Geddes' marriage a peculiar feature—a special engagement introduced with the assent of both on a point of real social interest; an engagement that when the stay of any children in India became impossible the mother should be with them. The ground for this provision was the principle that the future must pass before the present, that the children of Humanity must have the mother's influence on them; cannot be handed over to others however near, unless in cases of complete adoption—of the full substitution, that is, of a new parentage for the natural one. The time for acting on this engagement came much sooner than might naturally have been expected. The sacrifice was made, and the separation it involved was only broken by occasional visits to Europe.

During those visits, especially the last and longest, he met every call that the cause made upon him. His activity and the consequent impulse given was generally felt. There was the most social, friendly concert in all common action with the constant endeavour to foster union. And when that became more and more difficult to maintain, he exerted wherever he could a moderating influence without any trace of a weakly compromising spirit. On occasions he was most outspoken and resolute. The dissensions in our body grieved him, but he took his side firmly and with the fullest study. This, his home service, was continued in India. His thoughts ever reverted in the midst of all his hard work to his co-religionists at home, and to the means of advancing the common cause, despite the rupture which he recognised as inevitable. To clear up misconceptions, and to lessen bitterness whilst steadily pursuing his own course—such was his unvarying aim. Had he but lived, our hopes, our prospects as Positivists in England would be very different. Under whatever aspect we look at it, his death was an irreparable loss.

We can accept no illusory consolation. We can but cherish the memory and the grief, whilst we seek to perpetuate the life. We make a human use of an evil incident to man, but we confess it to be an evil. Such ceremonies as to-day's when they deal with a complete life, one which has run the full course, attained the perfect

measure, will have a triumphant character. It is the incompleteness which invests this present sacramental celebration with a necessary clothing of sorrow.

In death he speaks to others and through others, to us who knew him and through us to others. Our thoughts turn of themselves in this respect to his children, so early deprived of the sheltering guidance of such a father. They will call up that father's image and place themselves as they grow older under the power of his example. They will bring their lives' conduct into the light it gives, and will live their own life in the remembrance of his goodness, lovingly thinking of what he would wish them to be, in constant association with the highest and purest presiding influence of their lives. On their training whilst young—on their duties when older—light will be thrown by his memory, which they will be handing on ; it will teach them to be true to that consecration of the whole being to Humanity which characterised him. He was not born to it ; they inherit it from him and they will not derogate. It is from families formed on such principles of ancestor worship that the strength of the new Religion must come. With the disjointed elements of the actual church only provisional and uncertain results can be attained. The true beauty of our Religion cannot impress the world until it be seen through the continuous and renovated family existence. Meanwhile, whilst this influence is slowly forming, on the church—so I would always call our society as the term which best reminds us of our aims and duties—on the church which Mr. Geddes helped to found,—there rests the obligation of providing all its younger members with an environment of a sheltering and sustaining character. And if it do not grow as it should, if in the next generation it continue weak and scattered as now, or nearly so, those who, in the hour of its utmost weakness, give it as he did their life's service, will be to their immediate successors the best part of that church, the most useful, the most real representatives of the church of their aspiration, as having stood in the same circumstances, and so being the most intelligible example. By noble, peaceful, cheerful lives, irradiated by the hope and love which enabled their parents to devote themselves, sharing with those parents the

conviction of the certain if yet distant triumph of their faith, the children of the present and the near future may serve in their generation, avoiding the undue pressure which the hurry and natural impatience of a new effort has placed on the first generation of believers. Such pressure is a great evil and may and should be avoided.

If on the whole our estimate is the true one and is accepted as true, there is no reason to doubt that his influence will be permanent. It is not a slight assurance of permanence in days such as ours that it has stood so well the seven years' test, that both in England and in India notices of his value are constantly recurring,—most frequently in India, as is but natural and fitting seeing the devotion he gave her. Even whilst writing I have had two separate expressions of recognition. As with most similar influences, it tends to become indirect—to be transmitted, I mean, through others, through those who, like myself, have lived under it, and daily felt its inspiring and controlling power. The permanence I speak of is relative, no doubt. But for the present generation within the natural limits it exists, and will continue to exist as a direct force. Tested by results then, a favourable judgment receives an additional support.

On the calmest estimate, of what he was in himself, of his nature and character—in a word, of the man proper, the conferring of this Sacrament is justified and that without any blind panegyric. I know but too well the difficulties of such estimates, in which so much escapes, in which completeness is unattainable, and that which escapes is the finer essence. Yet I cannot avoid giving some estimate, such as a long observation and growing intimacy enabled me to form, such too as has been sanctioned by a constant recurrence to the support his example and life have given me. It must remain general. Special instances rise before me but cannot be given here.

In a high degree pure and unselfish : pure in both senses of the word, with the large purity which the due control of the selfish instincts confers ; generous too in both senses of the word—generous in his judgments and generous in his gifts ; apt to interpret wisely and expectantly the irritation of others, and ready, most ready to forgive its annoyance to

himself; with a just self-respect, and from his sympathetic nature necessarily alive to the esteem and affection of others; with his social instincts thoroughly developed, tender and venerated and protective; devoted to others' service, careless of self, gently thoughtful of others, never putting himself forward, yet with no weakness; clear and strong in intellect, inclining to meditation rather than to the more passive form; with his power of expression not yet matured; eminently courageous, in the highest form of courage; and if impulsive always prompt in correcting his impulses, essentially therefore firm and persistent: such would be my estimate of his moral and intellectual being. He was on the way, of that I am sure, to great excellence in his mature manhood. The inscriptions on his tombstone in India, on the memorial tablet in this room, express the paramount element of his life: his acceptance, his willing and manful discharge of duties. A favourite expression of his but condenses this: It is not necessary that life should be long, it is necessary that it should be noble.*

Combining these notices of his action, thought and character, we can understand the power of attraction which he exerted upon others, a power, as I have said, so largely attested. We have brought home to us the greatness of our loss, as a church in its nascent condition, by the premature close of such an existence. I repeat that as Positivists we recognise without illusion the order of life to which we are all subject. We sorrow for the premature separation. Our cultus of the Dead enables us to draw some consolation, but it leaves us the sorrow. We would not lose it in forgetfulness.

Keeping before me the character of this Sacrament of Incorporation, and mindful of the function I exercise, I have adhered as far as I could to a calm and impersonal statement, observing as far as possible the conditions of a judgment based on observation, my own and others' observation. As I draw

* Again I quote from 'Brahman the Priest': 'It was truly said of him by Mr. Cotton, that he seemed to have been hewn from the same rock as the Apostles and Martyrs of the Holy (Christian) Church. And if our own little body lives and grows, it shall always be our pride to recall his name side by side with those of Lobb and Dwarka Nath Mitter as the pioneers of Positivism in India.'

towards a close, I would venture a personal word or two, an expression—I am sure it will represent others—of affectionate remembrance, of devotion to his memory, of the enduring pain and sorrow for his loss. More personally still, I would say that in the ordinary intercourse of life, in the anxieties and asperities which have accompanied my course, the comfort his friendship and character have afforded is greater than I can say. So is the support which its recollection gives. He was one who did not grudge agreement, one who could state differences frankly and with courage: he could follow and yet help a leader. His experience of government had taught him the conditions of common action. If more slowly than I should, I recognised the beauty of his gentle and manly nature, I would atone for the mistake by the amplitude of the recognition when given.

To sum up :

I state the nature of this Sacrament and its relation to the other Sacraments, its peculiar features and its appropriate ceremonial, with the necessary shortcomings due to our circumstances. I state also what there is peculiar to the present case.

As the essence of our celebration is the judgment of a life, a service, and a character, I have very briefly given the outline of that life, a fuller estimate of the service and an appreciation of the character, the object being to justify the favourable judgment which the Sacrament implies, not omitting to notice what there is of inevitably sorrowful in our tribute. I have in conclusion expressed, as I best could, the personal feelings of admiration and love which many of us share, which all who knew him even slightly will acknowledge just.

What remains but the formal announcement which resumes the whole :

In the name of Humanity and as her Priest, I proclaim that

JAMES CRUICKSHANK GEDDES,

passing from the servant to be an organ of Humanity, henceforward living in others as in life he lived for others, worthily receives this final consecration of the Universal Religion—the Sacrament of Incorporation, the just crown of a noble life.
Amen.

CCC

Prayer for the Sacrament of Incorporation.

Known and unknown, thy servants, Humanity, have built up thy Past, the strong power which controls and guides the Present, and thy instinctive wisdom in thy earlier stages has sought in various ways and with partial success to honour and consecrate their several services, as a reward to themselves and a call to their successors. We thank thee for the Sacrament we celebrate to-day, the Sacrament of Incorporation, as the crown of this series of thy efforts. We thank thee for that it enables men by its wise and constant application to add with just honour to the sum of thy past servants all, in whatever station, conspicuous or humble, who shall make their lives, as he whom we specially honour to-day made his life, a dutiful and loving service; by such addition drawing into fuller light and greater closeness the continuity of thy successive generations. Lead thou us, gracious and mighty Mother, to a deeper sense of this commanding truth, so that it may work strongly on us for insight and stability, bringing to bear on us the power of high example and stirring us to the endeavour after a noble imitation. AMEN.

Concluding Prayer.

May the thoughts and feelings awakened by this day's celebration remain with us all after it is over, passing into our hearts and minds with a lasting influence and bringing forth a harvest of good fruit to the praise and glory of Humanity.

Benediction.

The peace of her slowly dawning kingdom be upon you, the blessing of Humanity abide with you, now and always. AMEN.

APPENDIX.

COMMEMORATIVE ADDRESS IN 1880.

In the Sacrament I have kept before me the judgment of the services rendered. I print in this appendix, in a very shortened form, the Commemorative Address delivered, in conformity with our Positivist custom, shortly after the death of Mr. Geddes. It gives some biographical details and other facts which would be out of place in the judgment. It also connects the two ceremonies, and may serve to show how little change seven years have wrought in our feelings.

Mr. Geddes died at Mozufferpore, and the burial took place, as is necessary in India, soon after death. The ceremony was, thanks to the honourable decision and courage of a brother judge, in accordance with Mr. Geddes' belief. There was nothing of a theological character about it. There was nothing but what we should have wished: the simple expression by a warm personal friend of his sense of the loss sustained and a tribute of honour. It was a great satisfaction that one was found ready to meet the difficulty and to avoid any distressing compromise in death. It was fitting that for one so real, so simple, there should be no touch of unreality or insincerity in the last rites.

Mr. Geddes was born in Scotland, March 1st, 1841, in Aberdeenshire. He was consequently only entering on his fortieth year at his death, March 9th, 1880. He was a member of the University of Aberdeen. At an early age he obtained an appointment in the Indian Civil Service by a highly successful examination. Two years after, he had fulfilled the necessary requirements, and he went out to India in the course of 1861, in his twenty-first year. His subsequent

life was entirely passed in the Bengal Civil Service. In 1869, after eight years' continuous work, he came home for a two years' furlough. He returned to India in 1871, having married during his stay in England. In the eight years which preceded his leave of absence he had earned a high character as a most competent servant of his government, with a career of bright promise before him. On his return his position was altered to a certain extent. His outspokenness, both on special Indian subjects and on general questions, more especially his most courageous expression of his opinions to a committee of the House of Commons, had laid him open to animadversion and the distrust of his superiors. He was called before that committee in consequence of a pamphlet he had published on Indian Finance during the earlier period of his stay in England. In '*The Logic of Indian Deficit*' he stated the conclusions which he had formed on that difficult subject, and Mr. Fawcett induced him to give evidence. It was a trying ordeal, and he was not well treated nor duly supported in the discharge of a very invidious task, which was not sought but thrust upon him. The Minutes of the Evidence bear out what I say. The questions put were needlessly personal and compromising—one at least was suppressed by a formal decision of the committee as particularly objectionable; neither was he given the usual opportunity of revising his answers before they were printed. As a practical result, his appearance there exposed him to attacks, and was calculated to do him serious harm in his profession. The wise tolerance which cannot but be admitted as a characteristic in general of our Indian administration did not fail it, however, in this case. It is possible that his known opinions made a misconstruction of his action easier in a particular case, and that in this way indirectly he suffered for those opinions. It is certain that for a time there was such a misconception and that he lost ground in the service—a result he bore with patience. But it was not long before the mistake was recognised and, as far as might be, atoned for. The general sense of the value of his work and of his ability had never been shaken, and there were no after evil consequences of this painful incident, so far as concerned his professional career. He had, it is

true, to check his utterances and to sacrifice to his official position his freedom of expression, but this was on general grounds. For the same reason also he thought it wiser to change the department in which he served and to transfer himself from the political, where higher openings exist, to the judicial, as quieter.

The change in no degree affected the character of his work or lessened his devotion. Neither did it lower his value as regarded his influence on Indian or Anglo-Indian opinion. His influence over the latter was due, over and above his personality, to the energy and competence he brought to the work he had undertaken. His influence on Indian opinion rested, no doubt, in a degree on these same qualities—but on something more. He had suffered in the cause of the governed—that was much, and his incurring that misfortune was ascribed to a feeling that he was unduly swayed by his sympathy with the Indian people. Without any qualifying term, it may be said that he had such sympathy. But the career which in early life he had chosen he accepted in the best spirit, doing well whatever work it brought with it. His judgment showed him that there was much to be done in the cause of a right and just government, even where the condition as a whole could not be considered satisfactory. He submitted therefore to the obligations of his early choice. So acting, the merits of his service were fully recognised. Practically, this was manifested whenever there came a real difficulty, such as a famine, or a new law bearing on the intimate relations of proprietors and tenants—relations of such consequence in such a population. On these occasions it was almost certain that Mr. Geddes would be called on for assistance in reporting or investigating. On matters of finance his authority stood high. In regard to them his loss is increasingly to be deplored. He could see and could manfully state the sole remedy—the only true method on which the finances of India could be satisfactorily dealt with.

With regard to his relations to the Indians, it is justly said by Mr. Cotton, in one of his beautiful letters, that India never has had, and never will have, a better friend. So, too,

Mr. Lobb, a dear and valued friend, always gave him the highest approval as standing at the right point of view, seeing what the Indians required, and having large sympathy with them. Similar witness is borne by men like Babu Jogendra Chandra Ghosh and the aged Brahman, Guru Das Chatterji. Wherever Mr. Geddes went, in the numerous and harassing shiftings of his appointments, he made the same impression on the Indians. They felt that they had in him a brother man, apart from them by necessity, but one with whom they could mix on terms of simple, common, human friendliness. Nor must I omit another name connected with him closely under this special aspect—the name of the noble Indian Judge of the High Court, Dwarka Nath Mitter, whom we have commemorated here and whom we permanently commemorate by a memorial tablet. His dying charge: ‘Remember, Geddes, I die a Positivist,’ testifies to his confidence in him. He had shown in his lifetime his sense of union by the way in which he mixed with Mr. Geddes and his family, on terms of pure social equality, of courtesy and parity, a case but too rare in the intercourse of the two races, an instance of the power of the New Religion to obliterate differences.

On a third point also I must touch. It affects more the private life of the man. I have received several testimonies of his valuable services to the younger English officials who were under him or in connection with him, of the sincerity of his friendship, of his readiness to see the difficult position of his juniors just launched on a new career, of help unostentatiously but effectually given, wholly irrespective of opinions. The attraction of his character secured the acceptance of his proffered help.

But he was more to us than an Indian Civil Servant. He was at the time that we knew him a Positivist—one in close connection with our body and in rapidly increasing sympathy with its action, bent upon spreading the doctrines, bent also upon living according to the doctrines. If in some respects we have to regret that a man like him should be bound up with our Indian empire, we must not forget on this occasion that it is to that particular connection that we owe our knowledge of, and our intimacy with, him. I remember well

his first coming to see me and the impression he produced. I remember the frank, pleasant way in which he said that he had come because he had read a pamphlet I had published upon India, felt its justice, and accepted its views, that perhaps more detailed knowledge might be valuable in support of the more general conclusions I had formed, might give what I had said greater reality and force than it had merely as the dictum of one who could only judge the question from a distance and from the moral standpoint.

The acquaintance thus begun rapidly ripened into intimacy. After a very serious illness, a recurrence with real danger of the fever from which he had more than once suffered in India, he came more and more into contact with us, and more and more intimate with the small circle which surrounded us.

I cannot quite avoid speaking of myself in looking back on his life; but my real object is to put him in as clear a light as I can. And as I hope by a review of the past to give you a true impression of the nature I have to commemorate, it is inevitable that at times I should allude to matters which concern me personally. His intimacy as you are aware grew greater, and at length he became by his marriage most closely connected with our family. He was present at the inauguration of this room April 9th, 1870; his religious marriage took place in it July 13th, 1871. During the whole period comprised within these dates, and during his subsequent stay in England till November, 1871, he gave himself unreservedly to the Positivist cause. It was the year of the Franco-Prussian War. In the discussions of the time, the utterances then put forth, he shared. His name is attached to several of the documents which were then issued. I need not here discuss them. I need only say that he never shrank from responsibility. Throughout he held the same opinions, shared the feelings of a time which we look back upon with pleasure, because it was a time when the whole Positive body as a body acted in concert. It was the only time that there was genuine co-operation in all its parts; he was not one of the least active co-operators.

Again, he was the first Englishman who accepted the Positive marriage, and thus stood forward when most would

have shrunk to take a step which people now, perhaps, think a little less formidable, and which each year makes easier, but which even now would be an evidence of courage. It required at the time rare courage to face the ridicule which might be poured upon such conduct. Mr. Geddes did not hesitate to make his own the courageous determination of her with whom he linked his fate to fulfil all the conditions of marriage in the New Religion.

They who are the first to receive such a Sacrament in its complete form take the first step which is the really difficult one, and which make the subsequent steps easier, for it is the first act which is always most exposed to obstacles. Both accepted it with the full conviction of its rightness and propriety; they accepted also the obligations which were involved in it, and thus effectually served the Church to which they belonged.

In the latter part of the year 1871, owing to the illness of his wife, he had to leave us to go alone to India, with all the bitterness of parting under such conditions. For the next four or five years he was in India, serving the cause as opportunity offered, acting in connection with those who were friendly to it, and offering a centre around which they could rally—the first and most necessary step to be taken. His wife joined him in the course of the next year, 1872, with their child. Two years later health considerations—the health of the children—made it imperative that she should return to England,—a much earlier separation than was to have been expected in the natural course of things.

In 1876 he made a hasty visit to England, and in 1877 a longer one; he then had a full year of absence. It was a year of trial and anxiety. He joined me in Paris at the very beginning of the discussion as to the direction of Positivism. He took the keenest interest in all that went on, and was familiar throughout with all that passed. Nothing was kept back from him—actions, or letters, or feelings. I looked on him as one in whom I could fully trust. This I had learnt to feel about him before his temporary return; I had learnt to look on him as intimately bound up with all we did here, in heart and spirit an active member of the body even when absent. When in England his co-operation was still more felt.

During our internal troubles, at times he differed with me. His differences were expressed in the manly open way which deprives them of all irritation, and leaves you free to weigh them as the disagreement of an affectionate friend. So again if in the expression of such disagreement he saw reason to alter his judgment, he was ready to say so. In the hot debate which took place in the earlier months of 1878 he, as many of you are aware, took an active, a foremost part. He threw himself into it with all the chivalry of his nature, which was recognised by all who were most opposed to him. He felt deep pain at the course things took, at the feelings manifested. Suffice it here if I say that he concurred in what I did, on a careful weighing of the whole case; that sorrowfully he came to the conclusion that I had not misjudged the opposition I had to encounter; that my consequent action had his complete assent. The circular explanatory of the new arrangement reached him in India, and all his Indian associates joined him in his adhesion to it. In the subsequent period one act alone connected him with the public action of our body, viz., his request that his infant son should be received into the Church of Humanity, the full ceremony being adjourned till he could be present. But his correspondence, his comments on all that has passed amongst us, his examination of all the questions that have arisen, of the line of conduct adopted, all this has continued to the last and has been of the greatest value. Here and there he has written papers which evidenced the depth of his interest, but which as they were left entirely to my discretion I thought it best not to publish. The mere lapse of time owing to distance often took from these papers their opportuneness.

He remained in India, in active service, over-worked I am afraid constantly, but yet full of heart, in a difficult position administering justice, watched anxiously, rather jealously by those around him, so much watched and so anxiously that there was an uneasy feeling as to the cause of his death, a feeling which I find has not wholly disappeared. But it would seem that his death was really due directly to an exceptional complication to which our frame is subject and which is independent entirely of the question of mere over-exertion. Still everybody alike bears testimony to the

fact that he was over-worked, over-tasked by the various demands made upon so willing and able a servant by his Government.

I have omitted one contribution of his to our effort which I ought not to omit. There is a definite Positivist writing by him—his lecture on the month of Gutenberg, delivered in this room. It would be a sad omission not to refer to that, because I believe there are here present those to whom it has been of great service. It is one of those publications that have been most useful. He was very free in his utterance, but what there was perhaps hurried and unconnected was overlooked and lost in the impression of the more than vigorous human feeling that pervaded it, the strong wish that it might carry conviction and be of use where he most wished it to be of use, that is to the proletariat whose interest he had at heart. The lecture has a moral beauty of its own independently of the form of expression. His other publications have been, strictly speaking, animated with the same genuine Positivism. They have been specially upon questions relating to Indian affairs during times of very great trouble as regards the commerce and finances of India. They have had a great value as drawing with prophetic spirit attention to that extremely difficult subject. But they were not welcome and he had to give up public writing, but his opinions were never concealed. There seems to be very great freedom allowed within certain limits in India, but every government must judge of the latitude of expression it can allow its members. His private influence was of high utility to us. It was, I repeat, of great value to our religion that an able servant could put forward a doctrine and a method which enables people to judge soundly on such very complicated questions. In one case he effected a complete conversion of an antagonist who now decidedly adopts the views he combated, though he has not become a Positivist.

Mr. Geddes' inner life is a theme more difficult. I may say that in this inner sphere he carried out to the full the obligations which his religion laid upon him, that the stern duty of the most painful sacrifice was accepted and discharged by both parties in the noblest spirit: there was no murmur or objection raised. But none can know how great the

sacrifice was, none can know the depth of the suffering it brought with it. I know it has in some degree been condemned—where there is a conflict of duties people will look differently on a particular course, and it is well that it should be recognised distinctly by all of us that the duty acknowledged as supreme was one that involved the greatest pain to both, a pain which nothing can compensate, but it was accepted, I repeat, in a spirit of unquestioning submission and the manliest, most noble resignation. In all respects Mr. Geddes carried out the obligations which he took upon him by his assent to the Religion of Humanity, and so has avouched more openly in the face of the world that assent.

In all the other obligations of life, in all his duties, he proved himself true to his principles. His was a nature which at first sight might deceive people. There was an apparent readiness rather to cede than not, but the more you pressed the more the energy and sweetness of his disposition came out under the pressure. As we grew more and more to know him, we got to feel the high value that attached to such a man. His loss is something very great to us, and I believe it is felt to be so by all in the degree of their knowledge. With an inner circle it is of course a different thing, it is a void which cannot be filled. It may be permitted me to say that I have lost in him what cannot be replaced—one who was very near in all my feelings, thoughts, hopes, and plans. There are certain functions in life which men only can discharge, and I had looked to him for the discharge of these functions. I looked to him to fill my place in many respects when I was gone. Further, his adhesion to Positivism had brought a fresh life into all our action. His association with us had gone so far to diminish the sense of the isolation in which our convictions then placed us. Those who now come to the new faith can hardly realise the period when all was different, the years when hardly any lent their countenance, and can hardly therefore realise the deep satisfaction of such an adhesion as his. The nobleness of his nature early made itself felt. It enabled him to overcome any irritation, to answer it by unfeigned tenderness and affection. He was very great in his indulgent forbearance.

For such a loss there can be no compensation. Death is

very busy amongst us, and carries off at times those who have passed their lives in the service and leave us with their work fully done. But in this case it is so sadly premature a loss that we have to bear. So it has been too often. We can already look back on so many who have passed away with their service incomplete. It is the saddest of our human conditions. We can but submit with a noble resignation. In the presence of death there is nothing but quiet submission left us, and sorrow. When we pass from its immediate presence and can look back on the life ended, we see that our wisdom is to treasure up all its good influences, to weave it into our own, to carry on its work, to be faithful in our remembrance, to let the thought of him sweeten life even whilst it saddens it most deeply. This is what those who pass from us would wish, that they might be a presence to us, an influence to strengthen and raise those who survive them, so they may live in us and still serve others,—live for others.

Very imperfect in its expression must be the tribute paid, very inadequate to convey the deep honour which we feel for his memory. Loyalty in all the relations of his life, energy, tenderness, and purity, these were the qualities by which he acted on all who were privileged to see anear his fresh, impulsive, generous, and beautiful nature, to come within the power of its attaching influence. He was moving towards his maturity. I had hoped he would have taken the corresponding Sacrament in this room. Such deficiencies as there were would have been corrected by his constant watchfulness over himself, for there was a certain immaturity which age would naturally remove. Sincere and simple, true to himself, most unselfish towards others, under such feelings his intellect and character would have ripened in their just measure.

ACT OF COMMEMORATION.

In the name of the Past, in the interest of the Future, we of the Present commemorate with veneration and gratitude the services of the successive generations of men—the services which have raised Humanity from Her original weakness to Her actual power, enabling Her to assume Her rightful sovereignty. We offer Her our homage for Her fetichistic infancy and its acquisitions; for Her theocratic childhood and its order; for our Western progress, both in its more organic and in its more disorderly period;—for the Greco-Roman and the Medieval organisations and for the Modern Revolution;—for our advance in intellect, social union and affection;—as also for the manifold inheritance of our immediate past. In this unbroken series of our Progenitors, whether Eastern or Western, we recall with reverence the religious teachers of mankind,—giving special honour to Moses and St. Paul;—the poets of antiquity and of later times with their highest representatives—Homer, Dante, and Shakespeare;—the philosophers and philosophic thinkers in the eminent types of Aristotle and Descartes;—the scientific thinkers represented by Archimedes and Bichat;—the statesmen who have consolidated and sheltered the West, their succession being embodied in Cæsar, Charlemagne, and Frederic;—lastly the industrial direction of the modern period and of the future, personified and foreshadowed in Gutenberg;—in all her personal representatives alike honouring the Humanity who has spoken through them, whose organs they have been in her partial manifestations through whose co-operation alone their endeavours have borne fruit, for their, and our, and all human time.

This form, introduced in 1891, immediately precedes the Sermon on Sunday morning at the Church of Humanity.

RÉPUBLIQUE OCCIDENTALE.

L'AMOUR POUR PRINCIPE
ET L'ORDRE POUR BASE;
LE PROGRÈS POUR BUT.

VIVRE POUR AUTRUI.

VIVRE AU GRAND JOUR.

Londres, 17 Mecklenburgh Square,
le 28 St. Paul 90 (le 17 Juin, 1878).

CIRCULAIRE ADRESSÉE À TOUS MES CORELIGIONNAIRES, À TOUS LES DISCIPLES D'AUGUSTE COMTE.

Les deux circulaires de M. Laffitte, de la fin de l'année dernière et du commencement de cette année, auraient nécessité une explication de ma part, même si j'avais été disposé à garder le silence. Et par ce qu'elles disent, et par ce qu'elles ne disent pas, que leur auteur l'ait voulu ou non, elles imposent le devoir de parler à ceux qui n'acceptent pas sa manière de voir. Du reste, dans les circonstances où se trouve le positivisme une décision est à prendre et à motiver, et c'est là le but que je me propose dans ce que je vais dire.

Je ne me laisserai pas aller à la critique en détail, quoique les deux circulaires y prêtent. Si je relève certains points, c'est que j'y vois une utilité publique, et je passerai rapidement pour en venir à quelques observations générales qui sont indispensables.

La date assignée à la première, celle de 88 (1876), est à regretter. L'épreuve ne m'en a été remise que le 4 Moïse, 90 (le 4 Janvier, 1878). Cependant elle porte la date du 28 Moïse de l'année précédente,—ce qui est d'autant plus regrettable qu'elle a été rédigée sous le coup des mêmes impressions que la suivante. Elle n'est que la première partie d'une défense qui s'accroît dans la circulaire suivante, celle de l'année 89 (1877).

Je trouve aussi regrettables la manière dont est traité le subside,*

* En parlant du subside, M. Laffitte dit qu'il a commencé avec 37 souscripteurs, dont 20 Français et 17 Occidentaux. Mais la huitième circulaire, la dernière d'Auguste Comte, accuse le chiffre de 52 souscripteurs français. Que sont devenus les 32 qui manquent dans le chiffre de M. Laffitte, a-t-on fait ce qu'il fallait faire pour les retenir? Il continue: Jusqu'en 1862 le subside a reposé essentiellement sur la participation exceptionnelle de MM. de Constant et Winstanley. Leur mort, en cette année 1862, ramena le subside à la moyenne de 3,830 francs et le nombre des souscripteurs à celle de 51 de 1863 à 1867. En 1868 le montant du subside fut de 4,649 frs. 75 cs. (2,413 francs pour la France, et 1,876 pour l'Occident), et le nombre des souscripteurs de 58 (dont 31 français, 21 occidentaux, et 6 anonymes). A partir de cette

la place faite au journalisme, et plusieurs des détails minutieux qui ne sont que d'un médiocre intérêt pour notre public occidental. Mais je n'insiste pas. J'en viens à quelque chose de plus grave.

La seconde circulaire est 'le récit de ce qui a été fait pendant l'année 1877' (89) ou, encore, nous présente 'l'ensemble de l'évolution du Positivisme pendant l'année 1877.' Et pourtant il y a eu autre chose—et pourquoi n'en est-il pas question? Comment expliquer cette réticence? Pourquoi laisser ignorer aux positivistes la crise dans le sein du Positivisme qui a éclaté cette année et qui n'intéressait rien moins que sa direction centrale et l'union générale de ses adhérents en France et hors de France? Un lecteur attentif pourrait bien se douter, d'après un certain changement de ton, un certain souffle polémique, que quelque trouble était survenu, mais rien ne le met à même de savoir ce qui en était, de se rendre compte de la différence de rédaction qu'il constate. Il y a là une défense où n'apparaît aucun adversaire, une affirmation dont rien ne trahit le motif. Je me demande si nous devons nous contenter d'un tel exposé comme une suffisante représentation de l'ensemble des événements. Je ne le crois pas, et obéissant à notre devise morale, *Vivre au grand jour*, je parlerai, de mon point de vue bien entendu, de ce que j'ai appelé une crise dans le sein du Positivisme. Il est indispensable d'en parler en vue de notre action ultérieure.

Il y a eu donc, dans le courant de l'année 89 (1877), et dans le groupe Parisien surtout, un mouvement assez général de mécontentement qui s'adressait à la direction officiellement reconnue jusqu'alors—mouvement antérieur à la crise proprement dite et indépendant d'elle. Je désire ne rien exagérer, mais il est certain que beaucoup des Positivistes français, soldats de la première heure aussi bien que de jeunes recrues, étaient d'avis qu'une amélioration notable de la direction était à souhaiter, et qu'une nouvelle impulsion devait se faire sentir afin que l'action totale répondît mieux à nos besoins actuels—que le passé enfin ne semblait pas nous promettre un avenir acceptable. Jusque là nous serons d'accord. Qu'il y ait eu, dès le commencement, divergence quant à l'étendue du mal et surtout quant aux remèdes, à y apporter, je le veux bien. Mais on ressentait un certain malaise et on cherchait des remèdes, et on était assez d'accord quant à l'origine de ce malaise. Cet état de choses a continué, jusqu'à l'époque, vers la fin d'Octobre, où l'explosion a eu lieu. La lutte a été vive de part et d'autre, peut-être trop vive dans ses détails, mais j'insiste sur ce fait, qu'on ne saurait me contester, qu'à son

époque un mouvement croissant et continu s'est produit dans le nombre des souscripteurs et le montant du subside, si bien que le chiffre de celui-ci s'élève pour l'année 1877 à 10,143 francs, et celui des premiers à 157 souscripteurs.

Je contraste avec cet exposé les chiffres en détail :—

		Francs c.		Francs.
1868,	31	Français, 2,413 75 ;	Occidentaux, &c.,	27 2,235
1869,	33	" 1,743 40 ;	"	33 3,392
1870,	20	" 1,750 95 ;	"	34 3,954
1871,	22	" 773 25 ;	"	41 4,773
1872,	28	" 715 60 ;	"	52 5,453
1873,	73	" 2,847 65 ;	"	36 5,372
1874,	88	" 2,021 85 ;	"	46 6,472
1875,	14	" 2,317 40 ;	"	47 6,457
1876,	91	" 2,345 75 ;	"	55 6,581
1877,	96	" 2,792 40 ;	"	61 7,351

On voit, par ces chiffres, que de 1868 à 1872 le subside français a été en décroissance notable, étant tombé de 2,413 francs et de 31 souscripteurs, à 715 frs. 60 c. et 28 souscripteurs. Il ne s'est relevé l'année suivante que grâce à une intervention active et un peu menaçante des souscripteurs anglais. Ne fallait-il pas distinguer un peu et présenter autrement cette partie de l'œuvre commune. J'avais déjà réclamé auprès de M. Lafitte contre sa présentation, mais inutilement. N'eût-il dépendu que de lui, le subside eût disparu.

début le mouvement était assez répandu, ne se bornant pas à un ou deux individus, mais englobant beaucoup des Positivistes parisiens et français. Peu à peu il y a eu un retour. Par divers motifs, et surtout par la crainte d'une scission, les dissidents, pour la plupart, ont repris leur attitude antérieure, en se contentant de quelques réformes secondaires. Et on en est à regarder la crise comme terminée, et à s'attendre à ce que ceux qui ne se sont pas encore ralliés reviendront sur leur décision et accepteront l'ordre rétabli. C'est de ce point de vue que me semblent rédigées les circulaires, la dernière surtout. Est-ce par politique? Est-ce par conviction? Je n'en dis rien. Mais encore une fois, pourquoi est-elle muette sur le fait de ce mouvement d'opposition?

Quoi qu'il en soit, je me place à un tout autre point de vue. Pour moi, la crise a eu pour résultat de nous laisser divisés, sans trop d'espoir d'une réunion. L'examen approfondi de notre état qui en faisait le fond n'a pas pu aboutir chez tout le monde à un acquiescement renouvelé. Un dissentiment plus réfléchi, de plus longue date, ne se laisse pas effacer si promptement—on est revenu sur l'ensemble de notre passé, sur ce qui a été fait et ce qui n'a pas été fait, et on s'est demandé si, effectivement, il n'y avait pas mieux à faire que de reprendre un *status quo* qui ne laissait entrevoir aucune amélioration suffisante, puisque l'on ne convenait pas même de la nécessité d'une modification profonde. La satisfaction qu'inspire sa gestion à M. Laffitte ne se communique pas à tous. Il nous a dit, il nous le dit encore, qu'en somme la direction a été bonne, que les vingt années qu'elle a duré déposent par leurs résultats en sa faveur. Pourquoi donc viser à un changement? En admettant sa manière de voir il n'y a rien à répondre.

Mais pour ceux qui ne l'admettent pas, qui, repassant l'expérience de ces vingt années, trouvent qu'elles témoignent contre la direction, qui en un mot la croient par trop défectueuse, que doivent-ils faire? Ou recommencer de nouveau en se taisant et en espérant, ou la changer: il n'y a pas d'autre alternative. Or, dans un sens il n'est pas possible de la changer. Mais il y a possibilité dès à présent de modifier essentiellement la situation, ce qui équivaldrait à un changement. C'est-à-dire, qu'on peut ne laisser subsister que de nom toute direction centrale, en attendant qu'il en surgisse une nouvelle qui donnera une véritable satisfaction à la généralité des adhérents, et en faisant converger tous les efforts afin que cette direction surgisse.

En indiquant une telle action, il m'incombe, car je sens que je prends une responsabilité, de revenir succinctement sur moi-même, et de ne pas décliner ma part dans ce qui s'est passé. Je parlerai avec toute la généralité possible.

Autant que personne j'ai poussé à la nomination de M. Laffitte comme directeur intérimaire du Positivisme. Pendant quinze ans je me suis subordonné volontairement à lui—peu content de son action, mais disposé à attendre, à espérer; me résignant à ses défauts et le soutenant de toutes mes forces, m'étant donné pour principe le ralliement du groupe anglais dans toute son étendue au noyau français. Combien j'ai été peu content de la marche des choses à Paris, je l'ai manifesté dans le discours prononcé à Paris le 24 Gutenberg 74 (5 Septembre, 1862). Et l'occasion se présentant, je suis intervenu de temps en temps pour modifier la direction et la pousser à plus d'activité, plus d'initiative. J'ai pu être importun, mais je n'ai pas manqué de faire des observations, quand il y avait lieu, en conservant toujours l'accord fondamental—ce qui n'était pas toujours facile pour quiconque suivait de près la conduite de nos affaires. Mais enfin on ne niera pas que, pendant cette longue période, ma collaboration a été loyale, ma subordina-

nation complète—à d'autres d'en estimer la valeur. Il s'agit ici évidemment de la chose publique exclusivement : les relations privées sont hors de cause.

Plus tard mon attitude envers la direction centrale est devenue autre. Dans une circonstance très-grave j'ai soumis à M. Laffitte une décision que, d'après une invitation formelle, j'avais arrêtée, lui offrant, et en toute sincérité, de revenir là-dessus et de régler la situation d'après son jugement, puisque ceux qui avaient provoqué cette décision refusaient d'y acquiescer. Il n'a pas même répondu à mes lettres. J'en restais là,—mais en même temps toute idée de subordination ou de direction disparaissait—à qui la responsabilité ?

J'en ai pris mon parti. Je me sentais désormais libre envers lui. J'ai continué à agir, comme auparavant, en appuyant le noyau français, mais je ne me croyais plus tenu à en consulter le directeur. J'ai continué à donner toute l'impulsion que je pouvais au mouvement positiviste partout. Je comptais aller jusqu'au bout dans cette voie d'indépendance tacite, en saisissant toutes les occasions qui se présentaient de modifier l'action centrale. C'est ainsi que j'ai fait, de concert avec MM. Audiffrent et Sémérie, il y a cinq ans, une proposition formelle à M. Magnin relative à la société positiviste de Paris—démarche qui n'a pas eu de suites. Et certes, j'étais bien autorisé à discuter avec qui que ce fût les réformes qui étaient à désirer et les moyens de les faire adopter. Mais je ne m'attendais pas à un changement complet. Il me semblait probable que les choses iraient toujours leur train et je me résignais à la patience.

Avec la crise de l'an dernier, et même avant son explosion, la situation changea. Je partageais le mécontentement général, et plus que personne j'étais à même de juger à quel degré il était justifié. J'avais même, il y a déjà longtemps, averti le directeur de la probabilité d'un tel événement, quoique je ne prévisse pas la forme qu'il devait revêtir. Lors d'une visite à Paris au mois de Juin, j'ai constaté à la fois le désir d'une modification dans la marche du positivisme français, et en même temps chez quelques-uns l'opinion qu'elle se rattachait à mon intervention. C'est là encore un fait général qu'on ne saura me contester. Au mois de Septembre tout en était essentiellement au même point. Sur ces entrefaites, l'explosion a eu lieu, suivie du revirement dont j'ai déjà parlé. Je n'entre pas dans les péripéties de la lutte, dans laquelle je ne devais pas intervenir directement, si intimement mêlé qu'y fût mon nom, puisqu'il s'agissait de m'adjoindre au groupe parisien d'une manière ou d'une autre, afin d'influer sur la direction.

L'effort n'a pas abouti. Mais pour moi aussi bien que pour d'autres, le revirement n'est pas possible, rien ne s'étant passé de nature à modifier mes impressions antérieures. Je juge notre passé comme je l'ai jugé, et comme l'ont jugé essentiellement beaucoup de ceux qui sont actuellement en opposition avec moi. Et puisque le cours des événements m'a amené à rendre public ce jugement et à y conformer mon action, il est hors de mon pouvoir d'en effacer les suites.

L'histoire de tout notre mouvement en ce qui me concerne doit suffire, il me semble, pour montrer que je n'ai pas agi avec impatience ou irréflexion, c'est-à-dire, en oubliant trop qu'une certaine imperfection, une lenteur inévitable, était inhérente à toute direction positiviste, vu le milieu et l'état de notre organisation à la mort de notre Maître. Mais je n'insiste pas—à d'autres le jugement de ma conduite.

Débarassé dorénavant de ces considérations personnelles, j'aborde la question des mesures que réclament nos circonstances. Il est temps,

à mon avis, de revenir sur nos pas, d'admettre qu'avec les meilleures intentions nous avons fait fausse route en partie; que nous avons eu tort de ne pas nous en tenir dès le commencement aux conseils d'Auguste Comte, et puisque nous les voyons pleinement justifiés par l'événement, d'y obtempérer, si tardive que soit notre obéissance. De concert avec d'autres, je crois qu'il faut pousser à un nouveau groupement, nous replier sur nous-mêmes et constituer selon nos sympathies un ou plusieurs centres de libres efforts, en renonçant momentanément à une unité centrale qui ne saurait être actuellement que factice et d'apparence —ce qui est contraire à l'esprit général d'un système qui se base sur la réalité—en nous assignant toutefois pour but de nos efforts de reconstituer au plus tôt cette unité centrale, s'il y a lieu.

Je cite ici textuellement le jugement d'Auguste Comte que nous avons négligé malheureusement. Il se trouve au quatrième volume de la *Politique Positive*, p. 542. 'N'ayant pu jusqu'ici trouver de successeur, ni même aucun collègue, je déclare que, si je disparaissais avant d'y parvenir, le positivisme se développerait mieux d'après les libres efforts de mes dignes disciples que sous un chef insuffisant.' Je le répète, l'expérience n'a fait qu'ajouter poids à ces paroles du Maître, et rendre plus impératif le devoir de s'y conformer. Le directeur actuel n'a jamais suffi à sa tâche dans un degré convenable; aucune impulsion centrale n'est venue de lui: j'entends par cela une impulsion qui, émanant de Paris, se fit sentir partout en Occident où il se trouvait des adeptes de la nouvelle foi, les relevât et les ralliât. Je tiens à en dire juste assez, à ne rien dire qui soulève des discussions inutiles, mais dans cette mesure je suis convaincu que personne ne me contredira en connaissance de cause.

On a avoué qu'il y avait de légitimes reproches à faire à la direction, mais on a insisté sur ce que ces reproches ne portaient que sur des défauts secondaires. Les incriminations qu'on a formulées avaient trait à des défauts personnels ou administratifs. Je suis d'autant plus dispensé d'en parler que, si fondées qu'elles fussent—et je les crois très-fondées—elles ne touchent pas le fond du débat, qui, pour moi, peut se résumer en peu de mots. C'est que, à la tête d'un mouvement religieux M. Laffitte n'a pas su imprimer à ce mouvement un caractère religieux; qu'il a manqué de toute initiative dans ce sens, et, par conséquent, le caractère principal faisant défaut, toute notre action a été faible, languissante, sans puissance à la fois comme ralliement extérieur et comme influence intérieure. Pour qui pèse bien tout ce que cette observation implique, elle suffit, et on peut la faire sans manquer aux convenances d'homme à homme. Elle ne regarde que le fonctionnaire public. Et si je m'y borne, elle exclut la nécessité de toute appréciation plus détaillée, sans m'exposer au reproche de ne pas reconnaître les services et les qualités que nous admettons tous. Mais il fallait aller jusque-là sous peine de ne pas assez motiver ma décision.

Décidés donc à nous conformer à l'indication ci-dessus citée, décidés à former une nouvelle organisation, il faut prendre les mesures adaptées à ce but. Dès lors j'invite tous ceux qui acceptent ma manière de voir à se grouper autour de moi, afin de constituer un centre de libre effort, et à agir en concert pour le bien du Positivisme. Je les engage à centraliser entre mes mains leurs cotisations annuelles que j'appliquerai:

1°. A l'exécution du testament d'Auguste Comte, en y consacrant une somme fixée en rapport avec les ressources qui me seront fournies et avec le nombre du nouveau groupe relativement à d'autres groupes semblables.

2°. A l'avancement de la cause commune, sous ma responsabilité, et

sous l'obligation de soumettre la distribution au contrôle de l'opinion des souscripteurs.

La circulaire de M. Laffitte ne représentant plus l'ensemble des disciples d'Auguste Comte, j'en publierai l'équivalent pour le nouveau groupe.

En somme, l'unité factice et d'apparence, dont j'ai déjà parlé, doit disparaître pour faire place à une agrégation plus libre, moins concentrée mais plus vivante, et destinée à nous conduire plus tard à une unité réelle. Une scission existe de fait, elle a existé longtemps à un certain degré. Nous rentrons dans le vrai, et nous sommes dispensés des efforts qu'il a fallu pour la dissimuler. Nous reprenons notre liberté, vis-à-vis les uns des autres, sans qu'il y ait nécessité de nous froder. Tout en poursuivant à part un but commun, nous pourrions bien à un moment donné, et pour un objet déterminé, nous concerter. La puissante doctrine que nous acceptons tous rendra nos efforts de plus en plus convergents. Il ne s'agit pas de lutte. Il s'agit de rester dans la simple vérité, de reconnaître l'absence d'une direction centrale compétente reconnue de tous, de ne pas admettre l'illusion d'une 'autorité visible' qui n'en est pas une, mais de viser à l'harmonie réelle, à une unité d'efforts qui surmontera finalement tout désaccord. Sans doute il eût mieux valu, infiniment mieux, que nous eussions été d'accord, que nous eussions pu conserver le groupement primitif. Mais puisqu'il en est autrement, il vaut mieux mettre fin à une union illusoire, qui est à la fois indigne et nuisible, c'est-à-dire peu conforme à nos principes et une entrave tant à notre action immédiate qu'à l'avènement d'un meilleur état. D'ailleurs au point où nous en sommes venus, l'apparente union ne serait qu'une gêne. La parole franche, la libre allure n'existeraient plus. Ce serait une vie peu supportable.

Je ne puis en outre m'empêcher de faire la remarque qu'après tout ce n'est pas précisément la scission, mais une certaine scission qui est redoutée. On se résignerait assez lestement à voir partir tel ou tel dissident, pourvu qu'un certain groupe ne fût pas entamé.

A qui la faute de cette désunion? Une armée en désarroi, un équipage en désordre, une association quelconque en décomposition, depuis un empire jusqu'à la plus humble institution, on s'en prend habituellement au chef correspondant. Je juge d'après le même principe notre situation. Après vingt années d'existence, nous eût-on bien menés, en serions-nous où nous en sommes? Nous y avons mis beaucoup de dévouement, beaucoup de soumission; nous croyons devoir suivre une autre ligne désormais dans l'intérêt de la grande mission qui nous a été léguée. Nous tenons à sortir de l'ornière où nous nous trouvons enfoncés, à reprendre la vraie tradition qui n'a été que trop abandonnée, la tradition qui se rattache au Catéchisme de la Religion de l'Humanité, l'appel direct aux femmes et aux prolétaires, aux cœurs enfin, en y subordonnant l'intelligence.

La continuité réelle de l'action positiviste ne sera pas interrompue par ce changement. La continuité formelle en souffrira, mais il ne faut pas y attacher un prix exagéré. Surtout faudra-t-il avoir soin de ne pas revêtir le sacerdoce de l'Humanité, le nouveau pouvoir spirituel, du caractère mystique et indiscutable de son prédécesseur, le pouvoir spirituel du Catholicisme du moyen âge. Le vicaire du Christ sous cet aspect était autrement placé que ne le sera le Pontife de l'Humanité, quand nous aurons enfin un digne Grand-Prêtre, et que ne l'est en attendant le pouvoir spirituel existant. Sa commission d'origine purement humaine sera toujours discutable, quoique rarement discutée. Il importe grandement d'insister sur la pleine liberté qui caractérise

notre religion à cet égard. L'unité si forte et stable, vers laquelle elle tend, deviendrait facilement oppressive si on se laissait aller aux associations de la Papauté romaine, considérée quant à son origine théologique et non à son action sociale.

L'enseignement, nous l'acceptons comme base essentielle du pouvoir spirituel. Seulement, pour le moment l'enseignement systématique ne peut pas exister, car il s'adresse aux adolescents, et nous n'en avons guère. Il reste pourtant deux degrés de l'enseignement, d'une haute importance tous les deux. D'abord l'enseignement mutuel, pour ainsi dire, celui dans lequel nous nous entr'aidons à nous former, tous tant que nous sommes, à la réception de plus en plus complète de la doctrine, en encourageant les efforts de chacun et en poussant chacun à la culture soignée de son intelligence comme devoir social. La forme en variera selon les circonstances. En second lieu, l'enseignement primaire qui peut se développer librement et servir surtout aux familles prolétaires, positivistes d'abord, mais nullement à l'exclusion des autres qui désirent en profiter, vu le manque de loisir qui les empêche de surveiller elles-mêmes l'instruction de leurs enfants. Il y a là, il me semble, un vaste champ ouvert à notre activité qui y trouverait une discipline salubre, en même temps qu'une véritable utilité.

Nous sommes d'accord sur la doctrine : c'est exclusivement sur la manière de la présenter que nous divergeons. Pour ce qui concerne le culte, j'en parlerai plus tard, après avoir examiné un peu notre union telle qu'elle a existé jusqu'ici.

Nous avons été plus ou moins reliés par la circulaire annuelle et le subside sacerdotal, finalement par deux fêtes. J'ai déjà parlé des deux premiers. Pour les fêtes, j'ai quelques mots à en dire. M. Laffitte insiste sur son institution de ces cérémonies. Il est peu fondé quant à cela, car la commémoration d'Auguste Comte était tellement dans les habitudes que son institution a été plutôt spontanée que particulière, et la fête de l'Humanité était nettement indiquée par notre fondateur. Celle de sa naissance, qui a été d'abord instituée, n'était pas bien inspirée. Elle nous donnait trop le caractère d'adhérents à une personne au lieu de croyants d'une religion, et faisait d'Auguste Comte le centre de cette religion plutôt que le fondateur, ce qui justifiait à un certain degré, si elle eût duré, la qualification de Comtistes que nous n'acceptons pas. Aussi a-t-elle été abandonnée et avec raison.

En dehors de ces liens on a commencé tout récemment la publication d'une revue comme moyen de propagande et de ralliement. J'en ai déjà parlé dans un mémoire à part. Un tel différend attend, pour le régler, le successeur d'Auguste Comte.

Le comité occidental auquel devait aboutir la Société Positiviste n'a jamais été formé. Il n'en a pas été question sérieusement, autant que je sache, depuis la mort de notre Maître. A-t-on eu tort, a-t-on eu raison ? Il est certain que rien n'a été fait, il n'y a eu aucun effort constructif en politique. Nous avons été trop faibles.

Pour la Société Positiviste, il est notoire que les réclamations de l'année dernière avaient en vue, comme une chose importante, sa revivification. Tout le monde peut voir quelle devait en être la fonction dans la conception de son auteur. Aussi bien en a-t-il indiqué la marche dans son testament. Depuis sa mort elle ne s'est guère acquittée de sa fonction. L'a-t-elle pu ? a-t-il été plus sage de ne pas le tenter ? Je laisse ces questions. En fait elle est devenue de plus en plus une réunion amicale, propre à l'élaboration des opinions, peu propre à une action politique vigoureuse et concentrée, comme contrôle

et stimulation, bien entendu. La puissante impulsion de son créateur eût pu en faire autre chose. Son choix d'un président prolétaire indique le désir de lui communiquer de l'énergie pratique. Son vœu n'a pas été réalisé; les fonctions présidentielles ont été exercées par un autre, et on en est venu graduellement au résultat ci-dessus indiqué. A tout prendre, ce résultat me paraît dans nos conditions actuelles le meilleur, et essentiellement en accord avec les idées du fondateur, sauf toujours la non-existence de son aboutissant, le comité positif. Momentanément nous devons nous en tenir là, et conserver ce qui a sa valeur, le moyen de nous voir et de nous entretenir.

Il reste une institution, celle des exécuteurs testamentaires; mais elle est en dehors de toute discussion. Il y a là une fonction permanente et un devoir des plus sacrés. Ceux qui l'ont accepté ne sauraient hésiter quant à son accomplissement. Sous la présidence de M. Laffitte, les exécuteurs doivent veiller à l'exécution du testament confié à l'ensemble de ses adhérents par Auguste Comte. Unis ou désunis sur d'autres points, à cet égard leur union ne saurait cesser. La partie matérielle de l'œuvre a été exécutée, mais il reste encore beaucoup à faire quant à la partie spirituelle, notamment pour les publications indiquées, et en première ligne pour la publication du testament lui-même. Mais c'est un devoir tout spécial que celui-là, et le corps qui en est chargé n'a pas d'autres fonctions. Il n'est aucunement fondé à intervenir dans les débats relatifs à la direction générale du Positivisme. Il y serait bien peu apte, du reste, étant, lui aussi, par des causes diverses, assez en désarroi, et très-difficile à réunir, même pour la simple majorité qu'exige la validité d'une décision quelconque à moins d'un cas d'urgence.

Voilà, en résumé, notre situation actuelle. Elle suppose une grande action personnelle pour la vivifier et pour donner une vraie force à des moyens si faibles. Je ne m'avance pas trop en disant que cette action nous a fait défaut au delà de l'attente la plus modérée. Partout on a senti qu'il y avait au centre une faiblesse qui réagissait sur tous les membres dispersés. Cela, c'est incontestable, et j'en reste là.

On accuse le milieu, mais il ne s'opposait pas à une activité de ralliement personnel, à une correspondance suivie, ni à bien d'autres choses qui nous eussent avantagés. D'ailleurs un milieu réfractaire peut être subjugué, et à la longue on se crée son milieu à soi. Du reste on peut répondre à toute cette inculpation du milieu qu'Auguste Comte n'en a pas eu de meilleur, à quelques égards pas d'aussi bon, et que, tout en regrettant sa constitution défectueuse, il marchait toujours dans le sens de la religion, en se souciant peu de l'opposition qui était assez bruyante. Je crois devoir ajouter que, à ses yeux, le milieu anglais n'était aucunement plus favorable à une impulsion vraiment religieuse que celui de la France, comme on le représente parfois.

Le culte, à un degré quelconque, ne peut être créé d'emblée. Le culte intime est une lente formation, variant avec l'âge et ne se complétant qu'assez tard. La création en est laissée à l'inspiration individuelle. Le culte domestique dépend en partie des chefs de la famille, et sera pareillement d'institution graduelle, aussi bien que la partie qui dépend du sacerdoce, les formules appropriées aux divers sacrements sociaux. Il en est de même pour les détails du culte public en ce qui concerne les fêtes multiples de la sociolâtrie. Pour la plupart elles ne peuvent pas être instituées dès à présent faute d'une suffisante extension de la nouvelle église. Mais, il y a lieu, pour celles qui existent ou pour les réunions qui les suppléent en partie d'introduire à titre d'essais des formules liturgiques qui puissent survivre ou disparaître, selon leur aptitude plus ou moins grande. De telles réunions, où se

fortifie le sentiment d'une communauté religieuse, font surgir graduellement ce besoin, et les assistants en accueillent la satisfaction même imparfaite avec empressement. Mais il ne faut pas oublier que ce n'est là qu'une préparation, une chose purement provisoire, qui comble une lacune plus ou moins sentie par tous.

Je le répète, il n'existe aucune divergence quant à la doctrine prise dans son ensemble. C'est uniquement sur la manière de présenter cet ensemble que nous sommes en désaccord, ce qui revient à une question de direction. Désespérant de celle qui existe, sans perdre un temps précieux, nous voulons en constituer une nouvelle.

La secousse est forte. Est-elle nécessaire? Ne peut-on pas atteindre le but sans en venir à une mesure que quelques-uns jugent extrême? J'ai la ferme conviction que non—vu le caractère d'optimisme habituel qui s'attache à la direction de M. Laffitte, qui n'a accepté aucun avertissement moins tranché. Mais à part toute impression personnelle, son propre jugement suffit, puisqu'en faisant un retour sur sa gestion, il la regarde avec une satisfaction incompréhensible pour ceux qui l'ont suivie depuis le commencement, et qui ont pu à toute époque y constater de très-graves lacunes. Je la crois donc nécessaire, et je la crois bienfaisante; elle a déjà été très-utile. L'inaction où nous étions plongés, en nous félicitant de l'avènement nécessaire, tôt ou tard, de notre religion, a déjà cessé, et l'impulsion a amené tous les positivistes à des réflexions qui seront finalement fructueuses. Tous nous sentons que nous devons y mettre plus d'effort personnel.

Toute discussion terminée, je m'adresse à ceux qui partagent ma conviction et s'associent à mon action. Nous devons former un corps uni, susceptible d'exercer une influence directrice, ce qui demande la coopération zélée de tous ceux qui en feront partie. C'est une union de fidèles, une église en un mot, dans toute la haute acception du terme, que nous visons à constituer, une société où l'élément religieux sera prépondérant, nettement et fortement accusé, de manière à ne laisser aucun doute sur nos intentions, une société à laquelle puissent se rallier ceux qui sentent le besoin d'un abri et d'un appui, des consolations d'une foi active et mutuelle. C'est par là que nous croyons devoir commencer en prêchant l'Humanité comme principe de ralliement, afin de concentrer une masse féminine et populaire qui serve de fondement à tout le reste; sur laquelle puisse s'appuyer le corps enseignant (et par corps enseignant j'entends naturellement un sacerdoce et des prêtres, non pas ce qu'on a trop l'air de nous offrir—des professeurs et un professorat)—qui, sans elle, sans sa forte stimulation, manque de base solide, comme il manque aussi de sphère d'activité; de laquelle, avant tout enseignement organisé, jailliront les premiers commencements d'un véritable culte, qui exige l'inspiration et le soutien du nombre; sur laquelle enfin pourra reposer une action politique dans le sens où elle nous est permise, non pas l'action politique directe pour laquelle nous avons peu de goût, mais une action de plus en plus sensible sur l'opinion, la seule ouverte, la seule qui ait pour nous une vraie valeur immédiate. A celle-là nous visons bien au-delà de ce qui a été tenté et avec la pleine confiance d'y pouvoir atteindre, si nous sommes assez énergiques et dévoués. Avec un tel but je fais appel à tous pour qu'ils apportent leur quotepart d'effort et de dévouement, redoublant de zèle en présence d'une grande tâche, avec conscience de ses difficultés, mais en y faisant face avec une énergie conséquente. La quotepart matérielle, les contributions pécuniaires, quelle qu'en soit l'importance, et elle est grande évidemment, et dans la mesure de nos forces à augmenter, vu nos besoins actuels et futurs, est loin cependant d'être le principal. C'est

l'action personnelle, religieuse, l'influence d'homme à homme, les encouragements mutuels d'après une communauté de sentiments et de conduite qui constitue la contribution la plus essentielle. Pour les conversions, comme Auguste Comte l'indique quelque part, il y a trois degrés : le premier, l'adoption de nouvelles convictions ; le second, la modification des sentiments ; le troisième, l'introduction de nouvelles habitudes, et c'est ce dernier qui est le seul décisif, et c'est surtout quant à lui que nous avons été le plus faibles. En y remédiant nous verrons accroître notre puissance d'attraction bien plus que nous ne nous y serions attendus.

Les commencements sont petits, il est vrai. Mais l'esprit qui a présidé à nos commencements a été grand d'une grandeur exceptionnelle, de manière à faire disparaître toute idée de petitesse. Quoique à un degré inférieur, on peut ne pas déroger, soit par spontanéité personnelle, soit grâce à l'inspiration communiquée et assimilée. Nous avons trop vécu dans la tiédeur, ou tout au plus dans un enthousiasme intermittent et de paroles, tandis qu'il en fallait un qui fût suivi et d'action. Il dépend de nous de nous remettre à la hauteur de notre début.

Pour cela, il faut nous placer habituellement en présence du Maître, nous retremper à l'étude de son œuvre et de sa vie, nous familiariser avec ses grandes conceptions et la marche qu'il suivait, toujours de plus en plus religieuse, en y pliant la science avec la plénitude de puissance qui le caractérisait. On peut bien saisir le sens de cette marche, quoiqu'il n'ait pas assez vécu pour nous la tracer complètement, ni pour y engager suffisamment ses adhérents. Tout en s'arrangeant pour une mort prochaine, tout en reconnaissant qu'après sa mort, suivant la loi ordinaire, son influence s'agrandirait, Auguste Comte désirait vivre jusqu'à l'âge de Fontenelle, afin qu'il pût prendre sur la seconde génération de ses disciples un ascendant qui les disposât à suivre sans hésitation sa direction, en abandonnant l'esprit critique qui perçait trop chez leurs devanciers. Son vœu doit nous servir de guide. Privés de sa présence objective, nous pouvons subjectivement la remplacer en nous posant de plus en plus en ses disciples directs, en devenant soumis et vénéralant au degré qu'il l'eût voulu. Ce serait pour nous, on ne peut en douter, une source féconde de nobles inspirations et de grandes pensées. C'est pour ne pas y avoir assez puisé que nous nous trouvons dans un tel état de division.

Nous appuyant sur son exemple et ses conseils, et devenus ainsi plus religieux, de plus complets croyants de l'Humanité, nous serons dès lors placés au point de vue universel de la vraie sagesse, et par suite nous serons plus aptes à juger l'enchaînement des diverses parties du tout. Le culte prendra sa légitime prépondérance, comme expression de la religion et condition nécessaire de tout sain enseignement, le préparant, le contrôlant et en diminuant les dangers, finalement et surtout comme constituant le plus puissant attrait de la nouvelle église. Le dogme et le régime s'y subordonneront et le compléteront, sans souffrir de son avancement. De cette manière tout ce qu'il y a d'affectueux et de sympathique dans notre doctrine paraîtra en première ligne, et l'impulsion qui en dérivera rendra moins effrayant l'abord de la science qui en est la base indispensable.

La question religieuse prime tout en Occident : science, politique ou organisation sociale. Voilà notre point de départ. L'Eglise catholique romaine a pleinement raison lorsque, par la voix de son chef, Pie IX. ou Léon XIII., c'est tout un, elle insiste sur la dissolution actuelle de la Société faite de religion, l'impuissance de tous les gouvernements en l'absence d'un pouvoir spirituel. Elle s'offre comme par le passé

pour combler le vide. Il faut hardiment nous poser comme membres d'une nouvelle église, sa rivale et son héritière—comme les véritables Catholiques de l'avenir—pleins de respect et de reconnaissance envers nos prédécesseurs, mais décidés à nous mettre à leur place et confiants dans la destinée qui nous y appelle.

J'en ai assez dit pour préciser notre attitude. J'ai condensé, retranché autant que possible, en m'efforçant d'écarter toute matière irritante. Quoi qu'on fasse, le déchirement temporaire restera pénible, mais on peut beaucoup pour en diminuer la peine. J'invite ceux qui se grouperont autour de moi, aussi bien que ceux qui adhéreront à l'ancienne direction, à y concourir. J'ai été trop lié à tout le passé du Positivisme pour ne pas vouloir voir prédominer le sentiment de la fraternité positiviste, en dépit de nos divergences quelconques. Qu'on regarde avec calme la situation, sans se laisser trop émouvoir par des prévisions peu fondées, et que de part et d'autre on écarte les personnalités et se dévoue avec ardeur à la grande cause, à l'Humanité que nous servons chacun à sa manière.

Noble et vénéré Maître, moi et d'autres, notamment MM. Audiffrent et Sémérie, qui t'ont connu personnellement, avec d'autres qui réveront ta mémoire, nous croirions manquer à notre devoir, si par défaut d'énergie nous hésitions à quitter une direction qui ne répond ni à nos aspirations, ni à nos besoins ; qui nous semble par trop insuffisante devant les exigences d'une situation difficile, il est vrai, mais moins qu'on ne le pense, si nous hésitions à remplacer cette direction dans la mesure de nos forces. Nous évoquons ton souvenir, nous nous faisons forts de ton approbation. En te restant fidèles, nous conservons une pleine confiance dans notre avenir religieux. Tes dignes disciples ne doivent jamais s'affaïsser.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

[*The English equivalent of the foregoing.*]

REPUBLIC OF THE WEST.

LOVE FOR PRINCIPLE
AND ORDER FOR BASIS
PROGRESS FOR END.

LIVE FOR OTHERS.

LIVE OPENLY.

London, 17, Mecklenburgh Square,
28 St. Paul, 90 (17 June, 1878).

CIRCULAR ADDRESSED TO ALL MY CORELIGIONISTS, TO
ALL THE DISCIPLES OF AUGUSTE COMTE.

The two circulars of M. Laffitte, written at the close of last year and the beginning of the present, would have made it necessary to speak had I been disposed to remain silent. Both by what they say and what they leave unsaid, whether their author wished it or not, those who

cannot accept his view are bound to explain their difference. Moreover, in our present condition, it is necessary to come to a decision and to state the reasons for it. Hence the present circular.

The circulars challenge criticism in detail, but I shall content myself with touching slightly on one or two points of public interest, passing to some general remarks which are unavoidable.

I regret the date of the first circular, the 28 Moses, 89 (January 28, 1877), whereas I only received the proof on the 4 Moses, 90 (January 4, 1878). This is the more to be regretted as it was written under the same impressions as the one which followed. It is the first portion of a defence which is continued more strongly in the circular of the current year.

I find matter for regret again in the way of dealing with the *subsidiary* (see note to the French circular); in the importance attached to journalism; in much of the minuteness of detail in regard to Positivist action, which can hardly be of interest to our body as a whole in its different Western branches. Without dwelling on these points I come to a graver matter.

The second of the two circulars is 'the narrative of what was done during the year 1877' (89); or, again, 'it offers us the whole Positivist movement during that year.' Yet there was more than is stated, and why is it not touched on? How are we to explain the omission; why is the body left in ignorance of the crisis which occurred within it during the year, where nothing less was at stake than the central direction and the unity of its adherents in France and elsewhere? A certain difference in tone, a certain air of contest, might lead an attentive reader to suspect some disturbance; but there is nothing to enable him to understand what it was, or to explain the difference of which he was sensible. It is a defence without any visible opponent, a self-assertion the motive of which is not revealed.

Is such an exposition to be accepted as a sufficient presentation of what has happened? I think not. And acting on our motto, *Live openly*, I shall speak, as I understand it evidently, of that which I have called a crisis in the Positivist body. I cannot avoid doing so, as it regards future action.

There was, then, in the course of the year 89 (1877), and in the Parisian group more particularly, a considerable expression of discontent, and its object was the direction as yet officially recognised. The movement preceded and was independent of the crisis, properly so called. I would not exaggerate, but it is undeniable that many of the French Positivists, of the earlier as well as the later adherents, wished a decided improvement in that direction, and the application of some fresh impulse to place it more in harmony with our wants, and that they did not see in the past the promise of a satisfactory future. So far we shall be agreed. I am aware there was from the beginning disagreement as to the extent of the evil, and still more as to the remedies desirable. But there was a sense of discomfort, an inquiry after some remedy or other, and a fairly general agreement as to the source of the evil. This state of things lasted till the period, it was about the end of October, when the explosion took place. The discussion was a sharp one on both sides, perhaps too much so in detail, but what I dwell on is the fact which must be granted me—that at its beginning the movement was widely spread, not limited to one or two individuals, but including many of the Parisian and French Positivists. Gradually there came a counter-movement. On various grounds, above all from fear of a schism, the dissentients mostly returned to the *status quo ante*, and

were satisfied with some secondary reforms, and the affair is considered as at an end; and the expectation would seem to be that those who still dissent will think better of it and return as the others. This seems to me the standpoint of the two circulars, particularly of the last. Is it policy? Is it conviction? I leave this point. But once more, why is the circular silent as to the fact of this movement of opposition?

Be the answer what it may, my standpoint is different. I consider that the crisis has left us divided, with but slight hope of our reuniting. At bottom, it was caused by a careful examination of our whole circumstances, and in all minds such an examination could not issue in a renewal of our acquiescence. A disagreement based on more reflection and of longer standing is not so easily set aside. A review of our past, of what has been done and what has not been done, has raised the question: can we not do better than replace ourselves in a position without outlook as far as any satisfactory improvement is concerned, since we are told that no really deep modification is needed? M. Laffitte looks back on his administration with a satisfaction which we cannot share. He has told us, he tells us again, that on the whole his direction has been a good one, that the 20 years of its duration testify by their results in its favour. Why then desire a change? If we accept his judgment, there is nothing more to be said.

But if we do not accept it, if on going over these 20 years we feel that they testify against his direction, if we think it too defective—what then is to be done? There are but two alternatives—to begin afresh our course of silence and of hope, or to change the direction. In one sense this last alternative is not open to us. But it is open to us at once to modify the state of affairs very materially, and this would be equivalent to a change. It is possible, that is, to leave the central direction a mere nominal existence till such time as there arise one of a kind to satisfy the general body of the disciples, and in the meanwhile to bring all our efforts to bear on the formation of such a direction.

At this point I feel it incumbent on me, as aware that I am assuming a responsibility, to say a few words of myself and of the part I have borne in what has taken place. I shall speak in as general terms as possible.

As much as any one I urged the appointment of M. Laffitte as interim director of Positivism. For fifteen years I acted in voluntary subordination to him, not over-contented with his mode of acting, but disposed to wait and hope; accepting his defects and supporting him to the utmost of my power, the principle I had adopted being the union of the English group, in its widest extent, to the French centre. How far from satisfied I was with the course things took in Paris may be seen from my discourse at Paris on the 24 Gutenberg, 74 (September 5, 1862). and from time to time on fitting occasions I have interfered to modify the direction and urge more activity, more initiative. At the risk of opportunity I have not shrunk from comment, always keeping intact, however, our essential agreement—not always an easy matter for one who watched closely the management. But it will hardly be denied that throughout this long period of fifteen years my co-operation was loyal, my subordination complete. I leave it to others to say what its value was. I am dealing exclusively with the public question: all private matters are irrelevant.

Later my attitude became different. In a very difficult conjuncture I submitted to M. Laffitte a decision which I had given, having been formally asked to do so, and which had been held unacceptable by those who asked for it. I offered, and in all sincerity, to revise it and conform

it to his judgment. He never even answered my letters. I was left to myself: any idea of subordination or direction was, however, at an end—on whom does the responsibility rest?

Thenceforth I felt free as far as he was concerned. My action continued, as before, a support of the French centre, but I thought myself no longer bound to consult its director. I gave all the impulse I could to the Positivist movement, and I expected that this state of things would be permanent, that in tacit independence I should continue to avail myself of such opportunities as offered of modifying the central direction. For instance, about five years ago, in concert with Messrs. Audiffrent and Sémérie, I made a formal proposal to M. Magnin in relation to the Positivist Society, a step which led to no result. I felt myself quite authorised to discuss with any one whatsoever the changes which were desirable and the means of introducing them. But I looked for no radical alteration. What appeared probable was that things would go on as they were, and I schooled myself to patience.

But with the crisis of last year, and that before its explosion, the position altered: I shared the general discontent and I was more qualified than any one to judge the extent of its justification. I had even, some time previously, warned the director that such an event was not improbable, without foreseeing the form under which it would present itself. On my visit to Paris in June I became aware of this desire for a modification of the existing state, as also that in the minds of some it was connected with the idea of some interference on my part. This again is a general statement which will hardly be disputed. In September things were essentially in the same position. Then came the explosion, and after it the countermovement already mentioned. I will not enter into the various incidents of a discussion in which I had no direct part to play, however intimately my name was mixed up with it, since it was proposed in one or another mode to attach me to the Paris group, with the object of acting on the direction.

The effort failed. But, for me as for some others, the countermovement was not possible, as nothing had occurred calculated to alter my previous impressions. I have the same judgment as I had of our past as Positivists, and the same judgment in essentials as had been formed by many of those who are now opposed to me. And as the course of events led me to avow this judgment and to shape my conduct in conformity with it, I have no power to efface its consequences.

So far as I am concerned, this history of our whole movement should be sufficient evidence that I have not acted in impatience or without due reflection, to the putting out of sight, that is, the degree of imperfection, the inevitable slowness which was inherent in any direction of Positivism, under the given conditions, the social environment, that is, and the state of our organisation at the period of our Master's death. But again I pass on, leaving my conduct to the judgment of others.

Turning then from all personal considerations, I enter on the question of the measures to be taken. In my judgment it is time to retrace our steps, to allow that, with the best intentions, we have in some degree mistaken our course; that we were wrong at the outset not to adhere to the advice of Auguste Comte, and since we see it fully justified by the event, to allow that we ought to obey it, late though our obedience be. In concert with others, I think we ought to aim at a new grouping, fall back on ourselves, and form according to our sympathies one or more centres of free effort, to the provisional renunciation of a central unity which under present circumstances can be but factitious and apparent, and, as such, in contradiction with the general spirit of a system which

claims to rest on reality, always putting before us as the end of our exertions the reconstruction at the earliest time possible of such central unity.

I quote the passage in which is given the judgment of Auguste Comte which to our misfortune we neglected. (*Pol. Pos.*, Vol. iv., p. 471, *E. Tr.*) 'Not as yet able to find a successor, nor even a colleague, I declare that if I died without finding one, the growth of Positivism would be sounder if it relied on the free exertions of my true disciples, than under an incompetent chief.' I repeat that experience has only added weight to these words of our Master, and made more binding the obligation of our conforming to them. Our present director has never been in a fitting degree sufficient for his task, no central impulsion has come from him, and by central impulsion I mean one which, emanating from Paris, made itself felt wherever in the West there were disciples of the new faith, raising them and uniting them. I would say no more than is absolutely necessary, nothing which could lead to useless discussions, but as I have limited my statement, I am convinced that no one will contradict it who has full knowledge of the facts.

It has been allowed that there are formal objections to be urged against the direction. But stress has been laid on this, that such objections bore only on secondary points. The reproaches formally levelled at it related to personal or administrative details. I am the less bound to touch on them in that, however well founded they may be, and I think them very well founded, they do not go to the bottom of the matter. This, as I see it, may be stated in few words. It resolves itself into this: that placed at the head of a religious movement, M. Laffitte has shown himself unable to imprint on that movement a religious character; that he has been wholly wanting in initiative in this direction; and that, as a result, in the absence of this chief characteristic, our whole action has been feeble, without force either for rallying others from without or influencing ourselves. Any one who will weigh well what such a remark involves will find it sufficient, and it is one which may be made without any breach of due respect as between man and man. It concerns the public functionary only, and by confining myself to it, I am freed from any obligation to enter into a more detailed judgment, whilst I am not exposed to the reproach of failing to recognise the services and merits, which we all allow. But I could not say less than this without leaving my decision inadequately supported.

As we have decided, then, to act in accordance with the advice above quoted, as we have decided to form a new organisation, we must take the proper measures. Therefore I invite all who agree with me to group round me, so as to constitute a centre of free effort, and to act in concert for the advancement of Positivism. I would ask them to place in my hands their yearly subscriptions, which I shall apply:—

1. In executing the will of Auguste Comte, setting apart for that purpose an amount in proportion to the resources placed at my disposal and the numbers of the new group relatively to other similar groups.
2. To the furtherance of the common cause, on my responsibility and under the obligation to submit such application to the control of the opinion of the subscribers.

As the circular of M. Laffitte will no longer represent the whole body of Auguste Comte's disciples, I will publish one as its equivalent addressed to the new group.

The general result is, that the factitious and merely apparent unity, of which I have already spoken, disappears to make room for a freer association of less concentration, but more life, and whose object it is to

lead us later to a more real unity. There is a real division amongst us; there has long been such a division, to a certain extent. We do but bring out this fact of the existing state, and we have no longer to make efforts to conceal the division. We regain our freedom of action as regards one another, without there being any necessity for our assuming a hostile attitude. Whilst we pursue apart a common object, we may quite well at need, and with a definite end in view, act in concert. The strong doctrine which we all accept will make our exertions to converge more and more. There need be no contest. All that is required is to abide by the simple truth, to acknowledge that there is no competent central direction admitted by all; not to acquiesce in the illusion of a 'visible authority' which is no authority, but to aim at a real harmony, at a unity of efforts which will ultimately overcome all disagreements. It would certainly have been better, infinitely better, that we could have kept our original organisation. But as we cannot, it is better to put an end to a deceptive unity which is both unworthy and noxious, that is to say, but little in agreement with our principles, and a clog not merely on our immediate action, but on the advent of a better state. Besides in our present condition an apparent union would be simply an embarrassment: freedom of speech and of action would have disappeared. It would be an intolerable existence.

I must also be allowed to remark that, after all, it is not precisely a separation *in genere* which is dreaded, but a given separation. It would seem that the departure of this or that dissident would be borne with equanimity, provided that one particular group remained intact.

Now, who is to blame for this discord? An army in disorder, a mutinous crew, any association whatever out of gear, from an empire down to the humblest institution, the rule is, in all such cases, to make the head concerned responsible. I adopt this same principle in judging our particular case. After twenty years of existence, had we been well led could we have been now as we are? We have given freely devotion and submission. We think it time to take a new line in the interest of the great mission which has been left us. We would get out of the rut in which we feel stuck, we would take up the true tradition which has been but too much neglected, the tradition which connects with the Catechism of the Religion of Humanity, the direct appeal to women and working men—to the heart, in a word, in due predominance over the intelligence.

The true continuity of our Positivist action will suffer no interruption from this change, though its formal continuity will. To this, however, we must not attach an exaggerated value. Above all must we be careful not to clothe the priesthood of Humanity, the new spiritual power, with the mystic character, above discussion, of its predecessor, the spiritual power of mediæval Catholicism. The Vicar of Christ was under this aspect in a very different position from that which the Pontiff of Humanity will hold, when we shall have a true High Priest, and which is held meanwhile by any existing spiritual organ. The commission it holds is of purely human origin, and will be always open to discussion, if seldom discussed. It is of great importance to insist on the fulness of liberty which characterises our religious system in this respect. The very strong and stable unity to which it leads might easily become oppressive if we gave free scope to the associations of the Roman Papacy, considered in reference to its theological origin, and not as regards its social action.

The systematic teaching,—we accept it as the essential basis of the spiritual power. Only for the immediate time there is no opening for

its introduction, for it is meant for adolescents, and we have few, if any. There remain, however, two forms of teaching, both of high importance. First, there is mutual instruction, if I may be allowed the term, by which we help one another to fit ourselves, all of us, for the more and more complete reception of the doctrine, by encouraging each one's efforts, and urging each to the careful cultivation of his intellect as a social duty. The form will vary with circumstances. In the second place, there is primary instruction, which may be freely increased and be of use to the proletary families, Positivist, but with no exclusion of others who may wish to use it, as from their want of time they are unable themselves to attend to the instruction of their children. In this direction, it seems to me, we have a large field open to us, and our energy would find in it at once a wholesome discipline and a sphere of true usefulness.

There is no disagreement as to the doctrine, we differ only as to its mode of presentation. For the worship, I will speak of it later, after first examining slightly the union which has hitherto existed amongst us.

We have been bound together more or less by the annual circular, the sacerdotal subsidy, and lastly, by two festivals. I have already spoken of the first two; I would say a word or two on the latter. M. Laffitte lays stress on his institution of these two ceremonies, but with slight justification, as far as I can see. For the commemoration of Auguste Comte's death was, under the prevailing habits, a perfectly spontaneous institution, not requiring any special effort, and the Festival of Humanity was clearly indicated by our Founder. The festival originally appointed, that of his birth, was not a judicious creation, as it fixed on us too much of the character of followers of a particular person rather than that of believers in a religion, and tended to make Auguste Comte, not the founder of that religion, but its central object, thus justifying, had it continued, to a certain extent, the name of Comtists, which we reject; consequently it was abandoned, and on good grounds.

Over and above these ties, there has lately been begun a Review, as an agent of propaganda and a means of rallying. I have already spoken of this in a separate utterance. Our difference on this point must wait for its settlement by the successor of Auguste Comte.

The Occidental Committee, in which the Positivist Society was to issue, has never been formed. So far as I know it has never been a matter of serious consideration since the death of our Master. Rightly or wrongly, certain it is that nothing has been done; there has been no constructive effort in a political direction; we have been too weak.

As for the Positivist Society, it is notorious that one of the objects aimed at in the demands of last year, and one which was considered of importance, was its reinvigoration. All may see what its function was to be in the conception of its author. Nor has he failed to point out what should be its course: it is indicated in his will. Since his death, it has scarcely discharged its function. Could it have done so? Was it wiser not to attempt it? are questions which I leave. As a fact, it has become more and more a friendly meeting, adapted for the elaboration of opinions, little adapted for a vigorous and concentrated political action, in the way of superintendence and stimulation, that is. The powerful impulse of its founder might have made more of it. By his choice of a president from the proletaries he evidenced his desire to give it practical energy. His wish has not been accomplished, the president's functions have been exercised by another, and gradually the

result above given has been reached. On the whole, under our existing conditions, this result seems to me the best, and in essential agreement with the ideas of its founder, if we allow for the non-existence of that in which the society should have ended, the Positive Committee. For the time we were wise to abide by it and preserve that which is not without its value—the means, namely, of meeting and conversing with one another.

One institution remains, that of the executors of the will; but it is not one which can come into discussion. Their function is permanent, and constitutes a most sacred duty; those who have accepted it cannot hesitate as to its discharge. Under the presidency of M. Laffitte, the executors are to see to the execution of the will, an obligation imposed on the whole body of his adherents by Auguste Comte. Whether united or disunited on other points, on this their union must not be broken. The material part of their work has been done, but there remains much to do in relation to its spiritual part, more particularly as to the publications pointed out, and *in primis* the publication of the will itself.

But such a duty is special in its nature, and the body charged with it has no other functions. It is not in any way entitled to interfere in the discussions relating to the direction of Positivism, nor is it qualified for any interference, for it too, from diverse causes, is in sufficient disintegration, and very difficult to be got together, even as far as the simple majority required to give solidity to any decision, except in case of urgency.

Such is, in brief, our actual situation. It presupposes a powerful personal impulse if it is to be made living, if such feeble means are to be indued with real force. I am warranted in saying that such an impulse has been lacking in a degree beyond what on a moderate estimate we might have expected. All have felt that at the centre there was a weakness which acted on all the scattered members. I am content with this statement, which cannot be disputed.

The blame is thrown on our environment, but that offered no obstacle to an active personal influence, nor to a regular correspondence, nor to much else which would have been a gain. Moreover, a refractory milieu may be overcome, and in course of time a milieu of one's own may be created. For the rest, an answer to any blame of the milieu may be found in this, that Auguste Comte had not a better one to deal with, in some respects not so favourable an one, and that whilst regretting the defective composition of the body which surrounded him, he moved steadily forwards in the direction of a religion, with little care for the opposition, which was loud enough. I feel bound to add that, in his eyes, English society was in no wise more favourable to a truly religious impulsion than French, though it is so represented at times.

The worship, in no one of its phases, can be created offhand. The private worship is a slow formation, varying with the age of the worshipper, and not completed till comparatively late. Its creation is a matter for individual thought. The domestic worship depends in part on the heads of the family, and will also be a gradual formation, as will be equally that part which depends on the priesthood,—the appropriate forms for the several social sacraments. The same holds good for the details of the public worship, so far as concerns the manifold festivals of sociolatry. Most of these cannot be instituted as yet from the insufficient extension of the nascent church. But in the case of those which exist, or in the meetings which are a substitute at present for the others, it is open to us to introduce, tentatively, liturgical forms which may endure or disappear, according as they meet more or less perfectly the want felt. Such meetings, in which the sense of religious communion

gains strength, gradually draw out this want, and those who frequent them welcome with eagerness even its imperfect satisfaction. But we must remember that the step is but preparatory, a purely provisional thing, filling a gap more or less felt by all.

I recur to the statement that there is no divergence as to the doctrine viewed as a whole; that it is exclusively on the mode of presenting this whole that we are disagreed, in other words, it is a question of direction. As we despair of the existing direction, without losing valuable time we determine to form a new one.

The shock is great. Is it inevitable? can we not gain our end without adopting what some think an extreme measure? My firm conviction is that we cannot, looking to the inveterate optimism which characterises the direction of M. Laffitte, who has not listened to any milder warning. But apart from any impression of mine, his own judgment is enough, since on a review of his administration he views it with an admiration which is wholly beyond the comprehension of those who have followed it from the beginning, and who have throughout seen in it very grave omissions. I think that the shock is necessary, and I believe that it will be beneficial. It has already been very useful. The inactivity into which we had subsided whilst congratulating ourselves on the certainty, sooner or later, of the advent of our religion, is already at an end, and the blow has led all Positivists to reflection which will not be without fruit. All of us feel that we have to throw more personal exertion into our cause.

I turn from all discussion to address those who share my conviction and adopt my action. We have to form a united body, capable of exercising an influence for direction, and we require therefore the zealous co-operation of all who join it. It is a union of believers, a church, in a word, in all the full meaning of the term, that we aim at forming—a society in which the religious element shall preponderate, clearly and strongly expressed, so as to leave no doubt as to our intention—a society which may be a rallying point to all who feel the need of shelter and support, of the consolations of an active and common faith. It is with such a society that we think we should begin, preaching Humanity as the principle of our union, so to concentrate a strong mass of women and proletaries to serve as foundation for all the rest; a mass on which may lean the teaching body (and by teaching body I understand a priesthood and priests, not that which would seem to be held out to us, professors and a professorate), which body, otherwise, having no strong stimulus applied to it, is without any solid foundation, as it is also without any sphere for its exertions—a mass from which, prior to any organised instruction, shall spring the first beginnings of a true worship.—worship requiring the inspiration and support of numbers; a mass on which, finally, might rest political action in the sense in which political action is open to us, not direct intervention in politics, for which we have no taste, but a continually increasing influence on opinion, the only action which we consider immediately valuable. Such influence we aim at far beyond what has yet been attempted, and with the full confidence that we may attain it, provided we bring sufficient energy and devotion to its pursuit.

Such being our aim, I appeal to all to contribute their share of exertion and devotion, with redoubled zeal, as the greatness of the task before them requires, not blind to its difficulties, but meeting them with a persistent energy. The material share, the money contribution, great as its importance is and to be augmented in proportion to our ability, looking to our wants in the present and the future, is far from being the

most important point. Far more essential is our personal action, our religious conduct, the influence of man upon man, reciprocal support on the ground of our community of feeling and of life. In conversions, as Auguste Comte has somewhere pointed out, there are three degrees. First, there is the acceptance of new convictions; secondly, there is the modification of feelings; the third degree is the adoption of new habits. This last is alone conclusive and final, and it is in reference to the last that we have most fallen short. If we remedy this shortcoming, we shall find our power of attraction increase very far beyond our expectation.

Beginnings are small. True; but the spirit which presided over the beginning of our movement was great with an extraordinary greatness, so great as to preclude all idea of littleness. In a lower degree we yet need not be unworthy of that spirit, whether by our own instinctive effort, or by virtue of the inspiration imparted to us and assimilated by us. We have lived too long in an atmosphere of lukewarmness, or, at best, in one of intermittent enthusiasm, an enthusiasm of words, when we needed one which should be consistent and active. It rests with us to replace ourselves at the level of our earliest beginnings.

To this end we must come habitually into contact with our Master, reinvigorate ourselves by the study of his life and work, familiarise ourselves with his great conceptions, and the path he trod, more and more religious as it was, bending science to the service of religion with the fulness of power which was characteristic of him. It is easy to follow the direction of this course, though he did not live long enough to trace it out to the end for us, nor to launch his followers upon it to the degree he wished. When preparing for a near death, whilst recognising that after his death, according to the usual law, his influence would grow, Auguste Comte desired life, a life as long as Fontenelle's, so that he might gain, over the second generation of his disciples, an ascendancy which should lead them to follow his guidance unhesitatingly, throwing aside the critical spirit which was too sensible in their predecessors. His wish should serve as our guide. Deprived of his living presence, we can subjectively supply it by assuming more and more the attitude of direct disciples, submissive to him and venerating him as he would have wished. Such an attitude would be for us, beyond all question, the fertile source of noble inspirations and of high thoughts. It is because we have not sufficiently drawn from it that we are in our present state of disunion.

Leaning on his example and his advice, and so becoming more religious, more complete as believers in Humanity, we shall be placed at the standpoint whence we may range over the whole field amenable to human wisdom, and consequently shall be better able to judge of the connection of the various parts of the whole. The worship will assume its legitimate pre-eminence, as the expression of the religion, and the necessary condition of all sound teaching, its preparation—its counterpoise,—lessening, that is, its dangers; lastly and above all as constituting the most powerful attraction of the new church. The doctrine and the life will be subordinate to it, and its complement, without suffering any impairment from its precedence. In this way all the sympathy and affection which are inherent in our system will meet the view first, and the impulse given by them will lessen the sense of alarm awakened by the scientific initiation which is indispensable as its basis.

The religious question holds the first place throughout the West, before science, policy or social organisation. Such is our starting point. The Roman Catholic Church is most right when, by the voice of its

chief—it matters not whether it be Pius IX. or Leo XIII.—it dwells on the existing dissolution of social order from the want of religion: the powerlessness of governments in the absence of a spiritual power. As in the past so in the present she offers herself as able to fill the void. We must boldly present ourselves as the members of a new church, her rival and her heir, as the real Catholics of the future—full of respect and of gratitude as towards our predecessors, but determined to take their place, and with a complete confidence that such is our destiny.

I have said enough to make our position clear. I have condensed, suppressed, as much as possible, endeavouring at the same time to avoid all irritating expressions. Do what we may, the division will remain a painful one, but much may be done to lessen its evils. I urge on those who group around me, as on those who adhere to the old direction, to aid in this object. I have been too closely bound up with the past of Positivism not to wish to see its full weight given to the feeling of Positivist fraternity, in spite of all divergence. Let us face the present with calmness, not disturbed by prophecies which have but slight claim to notice, and let us on both sides, excluding personal questions, devote ourselves with ardour to the great cause, to Humanity, whom both alike serve in their respective ways.

Noble and revered Master, I and some who knew thee personally,—I would name Drs. Audiffrent and Sémérie,—together with others who venerate thy memory—should think ourselves wanting to our duty, if from defect of energy we hesitated to abandon a direction which meets neither our aspirations, nor our wants; and which seems to us far too feeble in regard to the exigencies of a situation, which, if difficult, is less so than it is thought to be; if we hesitated to substitute a new direction to the measure of our ability. We evoke thy memory; we feel strong in the conviction that we should have thy approval. Remaining faithful to thee, we hold firm our confidence in the future of our religious movement. Disciples worthy of thee must never lose heart.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

RELIGION DE L'HUMANITÉ.

RÉPUBLIQUE OCCIDENTALE.

L'AMOUR POUR PRINCIPE
ET L'ORDRE POUR BASE;
LE PROGRÈS POUR BUT.

VIVRE POUR AUTRUI.

VIVRE AU GRAND JOUR.

CIRCULAIRE ANNUELLE

ADRESSÉE À CHAQUE COOPÉRATEUR DU LIBRE SUBSIDE
INSTITUÉ PAR AUGUSTE COMTE POUR LE SACERDOCE
DE L'HUMANITÉ.

Londres, le 28 Moïse 91 (le 28 janvier 1879).

La formation du sacerdoce positif devient la première condition d'une régénération non moins indispensable à l'ordre qu'au progrès.

Quoique les positivistes aient dû d'abord monter de la foi vers l'amour, ils doivent désormais préférer la marche plus rapide et plus efficace qui descend de l'amour à la foi.

AUGUSTE COMTE.

MONSIEUR,

Vous trouverez ci-dessous le compte-rendu de la souscription à laquelle vous participez. Quant à sa répartition, nous sommes encore dans l'inconnu, et il faudra attendre un peu afin de voir clair dans la situation et de mettre notre action en accord avec nos forces, nos besoins, et nos obligations. Nous avons, en rapport avec les premières, à pourvoir à l'exécution du testament d'Auguste Comte. Nous avons, en second lieu, à faire face aux frais de notre mouvement spécial, et, notamment, à ceux de l'impression. Un fonds typographique est indispensable et a toujours existé en dehors du subsidé général, tant en Angleterre qu'en France. 3^o Nous avons à tenir compte de notre passé et des obligations qu'il nous impose relativement au subsidé de M. Laffitte, en même temps que nous veillons à l'application de nos ressources au développement général du sacerdoce et de l'apostolat. En me bornant à ces explications, il est de mon devoir de reconnaître le bon vouloir de tous ceux qui se sont associés à mon initiative.

Je résume en peu de mots la situation positiviste actuelle. Mon discours de la fête de l'Humanité 91 (jour de l'an 1879) me dispense de m'étendre sur ce sujet. Les disciples d'Auguste Comte forment deux

groupes provisoirement, tous les deux ayant le même caractère occidental, sans aucune tendance au nationalisme. Ils acceptent, c'est-à-dire, tout positiviste de quelque provenance qu'il soit. L'un trouve son centre en moi, l'autre en M. Laffitte. Ils ont un commun but, une commune doctrine, la divergence ne portant que sur la méthode à suivre pour atteindre ce but, sur la manière de présenter cette doctrine—en un mot, sur la véritable direction. Ils doivent concilier l'indépendance avec le concours et s'efforcer de maintenir, où il est possible, la fraternité positiviste. Il est à regretter que la modification n'ait pu s'effectuer sans une irritation assez considérable, mais avec le temps et la réflexion on verra que la chose était inévitable, et les premiers mouvements passés, une suffisante coopération s'établira des deux parts. Du reste, il n'y a là rien d'inaltérable, et nous devons viser au rétablissement d'un certain accord.

Que la lutte dure encore, cela est dû principalement à la prétention mise en avant par les amis de M. Laffitte, d'après laquelle il aurait été indiqué par Auguste Comte lui-même pour la direction du positivisme naissant. J'invite M. Laffitte à intervenir directement et à déclarer nettement qu'il n'a aucune consécration de la sorte quant à sa fonction directoriale. Tant que subsiste l'équivoque il sera de notre devoir de chercher par tous les moyens à la détruire. Dans l'histoire des origines de notre religion la légende n'a aucune place. Cette question réglée, il y aurait lieu à espérer que peu à peu le calme nous serait rendu. Tout le reste, tenant à des appréciations personnelles, sera jugé par les événements.

Quoi qu'il en soit, il n'est pas à craindre que la cause de la nouvelle foi soit sérieusement entravée par nos dissensions passagères. Au contraire, elle est arrivée à un point où plus de lumière et d'air lui seront salutaires, et où la plus grande liberté d'action qui nous est assurée, quoi qu'il arrive, sera d'une haute utilité. S'il n'en est pas ainsi, c'est à eux-mêmes que les divers positivistes devront s'en prendre, car il n'y a rien dans la situation ni dans leur milieu qui puisse les empêcher de profiter de leurs nouvelles conditions. Ils ne sont plus gênés par une combinaison assez oppressive d'éléments réfractaires les uns aux autres. Ils travaillent à part, il est vrai, mais ils travaillent toujours, et peuvent apporter à la cause commune tout ce qu'ils ont de zèle et de dévouement.

La dernière circulaire d'Auguste Comte accuse 73 souscriptions au subside sacerdotal, dont 52 françaises. La dernière circulaire de M. Laffitte (la 30ième) accuse 157 souscriptions, dont 96 françaises. Je remarque, en passant, à propos de ce faible accroissement dans 21 années d'existence, que le taux de l'augmentation est beaucoup moindre pour la France que pour le reste de l'Occident. (En France, 52 : 96 ; en Occident, 21 : 61.) Avec un nombre si petit, un résultat direct si nul, avec un total d'à peu près deux cents disciples complets, acceptant c'est-à-dire, quoique à des degrés divers, la religion de l'Humanité, il n'y a lieu qu'à se demander quel est l'arrangement de nos forces qui les rendrait le plus disponibles. Nous avons fait l'essai d'une union assez étroite. Elle n'a pas trop réussi. Sans tiraillements, sans hostilité, nous en voulons une plus large à l'avenir, et sans attacher trop d'importance à une forme spéciale, toute notre action se dirigera vers ce but, qu'en effet nous avons déjà atteint.

La grande dispersion de notre groupe est un inconvénient, sans doute. Il se compensera par une plus grande cordialité, une union plus intime, reposant sur une plus complète communauté de sentiments, et, je l'espère bien, d'habitudes. Nous pouvons toujours nous liquer

suffisamment par la recherche des contacts et par une active correspondance. Suffisamment ligués, nous suffirons à notre tâche. La dispersion d'ailleurs agrandit notre sphère d'action, et en augmentant nos difficultés profite au positivisme.

Car il s'agit de cela essentiellement, et non pas de telle ou telle satisfaction individuelle. Je ne me dissimule nullement l'avantage qu'il y aurait à avoir sous la main une grande force numérique dans les principaux centres. Mais, en attendant cette concentration, il faut tirer parti de notre constitution spéciale, et trouver dans l'éparpillement même un moyen d'avancer notre cause, en prenant sur plus de points la direction qui nous revient. En France, en Angleterre, en Amérique, dans l'Inde, peut-être ailleurs, groupés ou isolés, puisant des forces dans l'isolement même, si pénible qu'il soit parfois, voilà ce qui nous incombe. Et, par la rapidité actuelle des communications, tous les efforts pour nous acquitter de cette mission deviennent de plus en plus solidaires et se concentrent sur notre but caractéristique, la direction de l'Occident.

Cela se voit surtout relativement à l'Inde. L'action des positivistes occidentaux ou orientaux, car il y en a là des deux, en exerçant une influence prudente et sympathique, tendant à éclairer et guider l'opinion, tant indigène qu'européenne, réagira nécessairement sur l'Occident proprement dit, en démontrant l'aptitude de la nouvelle foi, non seulement à inspirer une saine politique aux gouvernants intrusifs, mais aussi à modifier sagement, dans un but d'union ultérieure, la doctrine et la civilisation brahminique. J'avais toujours espéré que l'adhésion si complète de notre regretté confrère, l'honorable Dwarka Nath Mitter, ne serait pas perdue pour ses compatriotes. Après une longue attente, c'est avec la plus vive satisfaction que je vois se réaliser cet espoir. Les deux souscriptions orientales représentent, l'une un disciple déjà ancien de notre religion, l'autre un adepte de la doctrine positive, qui y a été initié par le noble magistrat, et qui, sans y adhérer, l'applique à sa manière, avec modération et fermeté, aux conditions traditionnelles de son existence, en visant à l'élévation morale de ses compatriotes. Par des raisons que je ne saurais qu'approuver, ceux qui ont de pareilles convictions conservent leur milieu antérieur en cherchant à modifier dignement la marche de leur vieille religion vers les nouveaux horizons qui s'ouvrent pour elle comme pour toutes ses congénères. L'Orient doit attendre l'Occident en se préparant toujours, et en évitant toute rupture prématurée avec ses antécédents. Tant qu'elle n'aura pas accompli son œuvre en Occident, la religion de l'Humanité ne devra, sauf des cas exceptionnels, exercer qu'une influence indirecte chez les autres populations, quoique accueillant avec empressement tout adhérent qui se sent disposé par ses convictions et libre par la nature de son milieu, à s'y agréger ouvertement. Et quand elle aura accompli cette œuvre, de tels adhérents ne lui manqueront pas.

Organe immédiat de l'Humanité, l'Occident, en suivant encore sa marche spontanée, va de secousse en secousse. Son avenir est plein de difficultés par où que nous regardions : son action extérieure est partout oppressive, sa constitution intime est peu avancée, soit quant aux relations mutuelles de ses diverses parties, soit pour l'état de chaque nation prise séparément. La direction qui se fait attendre ne peut surgir que d'une seule source, de la nouvelle religion qui nous a été confiée. En dehors d'une direction religieuse tout est précaire, comme on peut le constater d'après le malaise qui règne partout. Pour l'extérieur les états n'y peuvent rien ; ils ne poursuivent que des intérêts contraires. Pour l'intérieur, l'état seul, le pouvoir temporel, quelle qu'en soit la forme, le militarisme tempéré par le parlementarisme ou l'inverse, n'y peut guère

davantage. Pour tout positiviste ils sont également arriérés. Nous les acceptons, mais nous cherchons ailleurs. Et le parlementarisme n'est pas le moins dangereux, comme dissimulant le mieux la véritable solution.

Pour le moment, c'est dans les rapports mutuels des divers pays occidentaux que nous devons trouver notre principale sphère d'activité, tout en cherchant par les moyens appropriés à diminuer l'influence perturbatrice qu'ils exercent collectivement sur les autres nations. Du reste, elle cesserait spontanément d'après une sage union intérieure, dont la possibilité se rattache à une croyance commune. Il est à remarquer que ce champ spécial est abandonné implicitement par l'ancien pouvoir spirituel. C'est la question sociale qui domine l'encyclique du Pape. La constitution de l'Europe, le propre domaine jadis de l'action papale, n'y trouve aucune place.

En l'absence d'une foi commune, toute occidentalité disparaît de plus en plus. C'est à nous de la ranimer. Et, tout en reconnaissant notre faiblesse actuelle, nous ne manquons pas de moyens qui peuvent nous acheminer vers ce but, moyens collectifs en dehors de toute propagande personnelle.

Réorganiser l'Occident, sans dieu ni roi, par le culte systématique de l'Humanité, voilà notre tâche. L'institution de la fête de l'Humanité, dont la reconstruction spontanée est signalée par Auguste Comte (*Pol. Pos.*, iv., p. 411), a été le premier pas vers ce culte. L'opportunité d'un mouvement semblable pour la fête des morts a été présentée par M. Lonchampt, et cette nouvelle partie de notre culte ne pourra tarder à se faire adopter partout, liée qu'elle est à nos besoins intimes. Le temps n'est-il pas venu de faire un pas en avant ? Il existe certainement deux lacunes dans notre système naissant des fêtes positivistes. La première, c'est l'absence d'une célébration qui nous représente directement notre filiation au catholicisme du moyen âge. La fête de l'Humanité nous met en présence de son successeur et inaugure la substitution du nouveau Grand-Etre à Dieu. Son complément, indiqué par Auguste Comte, pour la première phase de la transition organique, et fixé pour le 3 Gutenberg (15 août), nous rappellerait directement l'héritage que nous a transmis l'église de St. Bernard, la juste glorification de la femme sous le type de la Vierge-mère, sans aucun mélange du mysticisme chrétien. Que notre fondateur l'eût instituée, il n'est guère possible d'en douter. Elle est réclamée par le sentiment de continuité, et en outre par les aberrations croissantes à l'égard de la véritable mission de la femme.

Quoi qu'il en soit, je trouve une seconde lacune dans la non-existence d'une fête pleinement occidentale, qui soit apte à réunir tous les positivistes. La commémoration de la mort de notre maître me semble défectueuse à plusieurs égards. Elle est de nature à être observée universellement par chaque société positiviste, pareille en cela à la fête de l'Humanité. 2° Le caractère occidental lui manque, tout au moins pendant la transition, car elle est consacrée à un souvenir français, objection qui tend à disparaître, mais qui est grave actuellement. 3° Comme commémoration d'une grande perte elle remplit mal sa double fonction actuelle. Le sérieux, le recueillement devraient la caractériser, et nous avons tous senti parfois combien peu la joyeuse réunion du soir s'accorde avec la cérémonie du matin. Finalement, la saison est contraire. Nous tombons trop souvent dans l'équinoxe, époque où le voyage de retour est très-désagréable. Pour remédier à ces inconvénients, que j'indique très-succinctement, il y aurait lieu à lui substituer une autre fête intitulée Fête Occidentale, et fixée pour le 1^{er} Charlemagne (le 18 juin années ordinaires) et nous ramenant ainsi au souvenir du

grand Empereur, le fondateur de la République occidentale. Plus tard, dans un avenir assez lointain, quand Constantinople aura pris la place de Paris comme métropole du genre humain, cette célébration se reportera naturellement au 1er St. Paul (le 21 mai), sous le titre de Fête Universelle, se rattachant ainsi à la mémoire du fondateur du catholicisme.

Reste un second moyen général d'activer le mouvement dans ce même sens vers l'occidentalité. Toujours urgente, la question d'une langue commune a dû prendre aux yeux de nous tous une nouvelle importance dans nos récentes discussions. Je n'hésite pas à le dire, le désaccord n'eût pu se produire si de part et d'autre on avait pu suivre sans effort tout ce qui se produisait. Mais ni les conseils de notre maître, ni les exigences sociales n'ont assez agi sur les positivistes, et surtout sur les positivistes français (*le peuple le plus étranger au devoir commun.*—*Pol. Pos.*, iv., 431), pour les amener à combler suffisamment cette lacune. Or, si grande que soit la nécessité immédiate de lier entre elles les deux nationalités qui seules nous offrent un vrai noyau positiviste, j'entends les nationalités française et anglo-saxonne, ce n'est pas sur leurs langues respectives que doit se porter notre principal effort, mais sur la langue italienne, la véritable héritière du latin, pour la communication universelle, comme Dante l'avait pressenti. En voyant les deux puissantes nations de l'Ouest renoncer ainsi l'une à la préséance sociale accordée si généralement à sa langue, l'autre à toute prétention déplacée à l'égard de la sienne d'après son extension coloniale et commerciale, les autres peuples, et surtout l'Italie, comprendraient à quel point la religion vient modifier le nationalisme, en le subordonnant à la fois à l'utilité commune et à la tradition générale de l'Occident. On ne pourrait guère donner une indication plus saisissante du nouvel esprit d'occidentalité qu'inspire le positivisme. En outre, tous les positivistes puiseraient une nouvelle force en sentant diminuer par un commun effort leur séparation involontaire, et accroître, par une étude entièrement commune, leur sympathie intellectuelle et morale. En y mettant de la bonne volonté, on parviendrait en peu de temps, disons une dizaine d'années, au résultat voulu, et longtemps avant cette période les formules religieuses pourraient bien se ressentir du changement, ne fût-ce que par l'introduction de la lecture en italien de morceaux choisis des grands poètes italiens.

En appelant ainsi l'attention sur les moyens positifs et religieux, moyens entièrement à notre portée, de raviver le sens engourdi de la grande patrie occidentale, en attendant qu'elle se fonde dans l'Humanité qu'elle aura préparée, je n'entends aucunement renoncer au traitement direct des diverses difficultés qui se suivent si rapidement dans notre milieu politique et social, encore moins à la poursuite de cette rénovation intellectuelle dont nous reconnaissons l'importance. Mais, ne pouvant accorder que l'école doit être organisée avant le culte, c'est surtout aux besoins relatifs à ce dernier que je me suis adressé, sûr de trouver ailleurs des occasions de traiter les grandes questions du jour, et bien convaincu que c'est d'une stimulation directement religieuse que dépendra toute activité vraiment soutenue et positiviste, dirigée dans le sens de notre régénération intellectuelle, vu la nature du milieu actuel, qui, certes, n'est pas caractérisé par une grande persistance d'effort avec une perspective lointaine. Et cependant c'est là où en est le positivisme.

C'est à la hauteur d'une situation si difficile qu'il s'agit de nous maintenir, et c'est par les sentiments et les habitudes que nous nous y maintiendrons. Et pour la propagation de notre religion, c'est encore là le plus puissant moyen, l'intelligence pure n'ayant qu'une faible force de ralliement, comme il est facile de le constater d'après la pénétration

si évidente des doctrines positivistes et la répulsion qui l'accompagne pour toute action commune basée sur ces doctrines.

Ne nous faisons pas illusion ; il faut sinon le fanatisme à une certaine dose, au moins une forte dose d'enthousiasme, si l'on veut propager une nouvelle religion dans toute la plénitude du terme, et notre embarras spécial, c'est de concilier cette éternelle nécessité d'un mouvement religieux avec le caractère si fortement scientifique de la doctrine sur laquelle il repose. Surmonter cet antagonisme, c'est l'émancipation de la science, la dernière et la plus difficile dans la série des émancipations indiquées par Auguste Comte. On y parviendra cependant, en le suivant de près, en méditant bien la marche de sa pensée, et en nous servant de jalons qu'il a posés pour nous tracer notre route ultérieure. Je suis convaincu que ceux à qui je m'adresse plus spécialement sauront accepter la tâche difficile que leur impose leur religion.

Je termine en renouvelant mes vœux pour que le désaccord actuel nous sépare le moins possible, pour que nous y voyions tous un incident passager qui ne doive aucunement annuler l'union fondamentale, ni faire tort aux sentiments de fraternité. Ils ont souffert dans certains cas, il est vrai, mais n'exagérons pas le mal. Les services que de part et d'autre nous pouvons rendre ne seront pas moins réels après qu'avant la division. Sachons les accueillir avec reconnaissance au nom de l'Humanité, sans nous formaliser quant à leur origine. Rivalisons de zèle à son service, c'est le vrai moyen de nous rallier. Et cette conviction, j'en suis intimement persuadé, domine chez notre groupe, et existe aussi chez l'autre, j'ose le dire, d'après plusieurs manifestations.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

Résumé général des Souscriptions pour l'année 90 (1878).

9 françaises	362 fr. 50 c.	{ Minimum	5 fr.
		{ Moyenne	40 fr. 25 c.
		{ Maximum	100 fr.
34 occidentales	3,456 fr. 25 c.	{ Minimum	3 fr. 75 c.
		{ Moyenne	101 fr. 68 c.
		{ Maximum	650 fr.
2 orientales	72 fr. 50 c.		
Total 45	3,891 fr. 25 c.	Moyenne	86 fr. 47 c.

[The English equivalent.]

SIR,

At the end of this circular you will find the details of the subscription to the Sacerdotal Fund. As to its distribution, we must wait a little to see our way, so as to act according to our resources, our wants, and our obligations. We have, in due relation to the first, to provide for the execution of M. Comte's will. We have, secondly, to meet the needs of

our particular movement, and in especial those of printing. A fund for this purpose is indispensable, and has always existed, apart from the more general revenue, both in England and in France. Thirdly, we must remember our past, and the obligations it imposes on us in regard to the sacerdotal subsidy to M. Laffitte, whilst we in no way neglect the due application of the means at our disposal to the development of the Priesthood and the Apostolate. These remarks will suffice. I have only, as in duty bound, to acknowledge the ready support given by those who have followed my lead.

My annual address for this year enables me to be very short in stating the actual position of the Positivist movement. Provisionally the disciples of Auguste Comte form two groups, if not more, both equally Western in character, with no tendency to nationalism. They accept, that is, all Positivists, of whatever nation they may be. Of the one I am the centre—of the other M. Laffitte. They have a common object, a common doctrine, the difference that exists bearing only on the method for attaining the end; on the mode of presenting this doctrine; in a word, on the true direction. It is incumbent on them to reconcile independence with concert, and to exert themselves to maintain, where possible, the fraternity of Positivists. It is matter for regret that the change could not be effected without very considerable irritation, but time and reflection will show that it was inevitable, and after the first steps we shall attain a fair amount of co-operation. Nor, after all, is there anything in our actual state which may not be modified, and we should never lose sight of the desirability of re-establishing a certain agreement.

Such persistence as there is of a contest is due mainly to the claim set up by M. Laffitte's friends, when they assert that he was pointed out by Comte himself as the director of Positivism. I invite M. Laffitte to step forward and once for all avow that he has no such consecration of his function as director. Whilst this point is in dispute, it will be a duty to try in all ways to clear it up. The *origins* of Positivism should have no legend attaching to them. This point settled, we might hope for a return of calm; for all others, depending as they do on personal estimates, will be judged by the event.

In any case there is no reason to fear that the cause of the new faith will be seriously hampered by our passing disagreements. On the contrary, it is at a stage at which more light and air will have a wholesome effect, and when the greater freedom of action which we have gained, whatever turn matters may take, will be highly beneficial. If it be not so, Positivists must seek the explanation in themselves, for nothing in their position or environment is against their turning to good account their new conditions. They are no longer encumbered by a somewhat oppressive combination of elements which were difficult to reconcile. They work apart, it is true; but they are free to work and bring all their zeal and devotion to the common cause.

The latest circular of Auguste Comte acknowledges 73 subscriptions, 52 of which were French. M. Laffitte's latest circular (30th) acknowledges 157 (96 French). As a passing remark, it is to be observed in reference to this very slight increase during 21 years, that the rate of growth is much lower for France than for the rest of the West (in France 52: 96; elsewhere 21: 61). Where the number is so small, the direct result obtained so null, with a total of about 200 complete disciples—meaning by complete, disciples who accept, though in different degrees, the Religion of Humanity—the only question we can put to ourselves is, What is the arrangement which gives us the greatest

command of the force at our disposal? We have tried a very close union. It has not been altogether successful. For the future we wish a freer one, without any disputes or hostilities; and, whilst not attaching too much importance to any particular form, all our action will tend to this end, which in fact we have already secured.

It is certainly a great inconvenience that our group is so scattered. We must make up for it by a greater cordiality, the more intimate union attendant on a more complete community of feelings, and, I will hope it, of habits. It is always in our power to bind ourselves together in the due degree, by cultivating intercourse and by an active correspondence, and once sufficiently united we shall be able to do what we want. Nor must it be forgotten that the very dispersion enlarges our sphere of influence, and if it increases our difficulties, is of use to Positivism.

And this is the real question, and not this or that personal gratification. I am not blind to the great advantage it would be to have at hand a great power, in point of numbers, in the chief centres. But, meanwhile, we must use that which we have, and make our scattered body subserve the advancement of the cause, by taking at a greater number of isolated points the direction which falls to us. In France, in England, in America, in India, perhaps elsewhere, whether members of a group or alone, and drawing strength even from such loneliness, painful as at times it may be, it is our duty to seek to direct the course of events. Communication is so rapid at present, that all our efforts to discharge this task daily become more and more interconnected, and centre on our peculiar mission, the guidance of the West.

Nowhere is this better seen than in relation to India. Positivist action, whether the disciples be European or Native, and we have both, prudently and gently exercised, so as to enlighten and to guide opinion, will inevitably react upon the West properly so called, for it will evidence the power of the new belief not merely to suggest a sound policy to the intruding government, but also to introduce such modifications of the doctrine and civilisation of Brahminism as may conduce to the future union of the East with the West.

I had never foregone the hope that the complete adhesion of our regretted coreligionist, the Honourable Dwarka Nath Mitter, would not be lost for his compatriots. After a long delay, I have the greatest pleasure in seeing my expectation justified. The two oriental subscriptions represent, in the one case, a disciple of long standing; in the other, a Hindoo well acquainted with the doctrines of Positivism, and owing his initiation to the noble Judge. Not an adherent to our church, he seeks to apply those doctrines with moderation and firmness to the inherited conditions of his world, and with a direct view to the moral elevation of his countrymen. For reasons which seem to me quite sound, those at this stage of conviction remain in their old environment, and aim at modifying the progress of their ancient religion towards the new horizons which are opening for it as for all its compeers. The East must wait for the West, preparing itself whilst waiting, but not prematurely breaking with its antecedents. Till it has done its work in the West, the Religion of Humanity, allowing for exceptional cases, must have but an indirect influence upon the other populations, though it gladly welcomes any adherent who feels disposed, and by his circumstances free, openly to join it. And when it has done that work, such adherents will not be rare.

The immediate organ of Humanity, the West, proceeds on its instinctive course by a series of shocks. Turn where we will, its future

is full of difficulties. It acts oppressively on all without it; its internal arrangements are yet very defective, whether we regard the inter-relations of its several members, or the internal state of each nation singly. The direction which comes not can have but one origin, it must be given by the religion which has been entrusted to us. Short of a religious direction, all is precarious, as is seen by the *malaise* which prevades the whole. In relation to those outside, the States are powerless, as they can have in view nothing but antagonistic interests. Internally, the State by itself, the temporal power, be its form what it may, be it militarism tempered by parliamentarism, or the reverse, is not more adequate. For the Positivist both forms are equally out of date. We submit, but we turn our eyes elsewhere; and of the two, parliamentary government is not the least dangerous, as it is the more successful in masking the true solution.

As yet our action must find its chief sphere in the mutual relations of the several Western countries, without neglecting any opportunity of lessening the disturbing influence they collectively exercise on others. This, however, would cease of itself were they rightly united with one another, an union only possible on the basis of a common faith. We cannot but observe that this field of international relations is implicitly abandoned by the older spiritual power. The Pope's last encyclical letter is almost entirely devoted to the question of socialism; the constitution of the European state system, the peculiar domain of papal action in the past, finds no place in it.

In the absence of a common faith all sense of Western unity tends to disappear. It is for us to revive it. And whilst we clearly see our actual weakness, we have yet the means of advancing towards this object, collective means as distinguished from our individual propaganda.

To reorganise the West without God or King, through the systematic worship of Humanity, such is our task. The institution of the Festival of Humanity (its spontaneous introduction is noticed by Auguste Comte, *Pol. Pos.*, vol. iv., p. 357, Eng. Tr.) was the first step in this worship.

M. Lonchampt pointed out that the time was come for another step in the same direction by the institution of the Festival of the Dead, and this new portion of our cultus will ere long be adopted everywhere by virtue of its intimate connection with the needs of feeling. Is not the time come to advance still farther? There are certainly two gaps in the present system of Positivist Festivals. The first is the non-existence of any ceremony which directly brings before us our descent from the Medieval Catholicism. The Festival of Humanity places us in the presence of the Catholicism which succeeds it, and inaugurates the substitution of the new Great Being for God. The complementary festival indicated by Comte as adapted to the first phase of the organic transition, and fixed by him on the 3rd Gutenberg (15th August) would at once recall to us the inheritance handed down to us by the Church of St. Bernard, the just glorification of woman, under the type of the Virgin Mother, but without any admixture of Christian mysticism. That our Founder would have instituted this festival scarcely admits of a doubt. It is called for by the sense of continuity, and moreover, by the growth of erroneous ideas as to the true position and sphere of woman.

Be this as it may, there is a second want in the non-existence of any completely occidental festival, adapted for the meeting of all Positivists. The commemoration of the death of our Master appears to me defective in several respects. By its nature it should be observed universally, wherever there is a society of Positivists, resembling so far the Festival

of Humanity. Secondly : The character of occidentality is wanting, at any rate during the transition, for it is consecrated to a French memory, an objection which naturally will lose its force later, but is serious under present conditions. Thirdly : As the commemoration of a great loss, it serves but imperfectly the two uses to which it is actually put. The grave and reflective character which is natural to the morning's ceremony has been felt by all at times but ill-accordant with the gayer meeting of the evening. Lastly : The period of the year is unfavourable. It is too close on the equinox, and the return home is often very disagreeable to those who have to cross the sea or the ocean. I but enumerate the objections. As a remedy it would be well to substitute another festival, to be called the Occidental Festival, and fixed on the 1st Charlemagne (18th of June in ordinary years). This would take us back to the memory of the Great Emperor, the Founder of the Western Republic. Later, in a distant future, when Constantinople shall have succeeded Paris as the Metropolis of Mankind, this festival will naturally be placed on the 1st of St. Paul (21st May) with the title of Catholic or Universal, so as to connect it closely with the memory of the Founder of Catholicism.

There remains a second means of quickening this movement in the direction under consideration—that of Western unity. At all times of great importance, the question of a common language must in the late discussions have forced itself upon all of us as urgent. I venture to say, our disagreement would scarcely have arisen had we been able throughout our course, on both sides, to follow all that was being written. But neither the counsels of our Master, nor the exigencies of our social requirements have availed to induce Positivists, and more particularly the French Positivists (*'the nation most alien to the common duty,'* *Pol. Pos.* iv. p. 374, E. Tr.) to remedy this deficiency in any sufficient degree. Still, however great, under our immediate conditions, be the necessity of binding together the two nationalities which alone possess a body of Positivists, I mean the French and the Anglo-Saxon, neither the one nor the other language should be the object of our greatest efforts. It is on the Italian that we should concentrate them, the true heir of the Latin, as the medium of universal communication, as Dante anticipated. At sight of the two powerful nations of the West thus renouncing, one the social precedence accorded so generally to its idiom, the other any misplaced claim on behalf of its language, grounded on its wide extension through its colonies and commerce, the other nations, and Italy above all, would see the great change introduced by the new religion as to the feeling of nationality, which it subordinates at once to the common welfare and to the general tradition of the West. It would be difficult to give any more striking evidence of the new spirit of occidentality circulated by Positivism. Further all Positivists would gain strength from the change, as they would feel their separation lessened thereby, and their intellectual and moral sympathy increased by the entire community of study in this particular. With fair exertion, the desired result would not take long to reach, say ten years, and long before that time our religious forms might be modified, were it merely by the introduction of readings (in Italian) of selections from the great Italian poets.

Whilst I draw attention to these methods of a strictly positive and religious kind, which are available for removing the numbness which at present weakens the sense of the great common country, the West, destined later to fuse with the Humanity for which it shall have been the preparation, I in no way abandon the direct handling of the several

difficulties which follow in such rapid succession in our political and moral world. Still less do I give up the pursuit of that renovation of the intellect, the importance of which we all feel. But, unable as I am to allow that the school should take precedence of the worship in our effort at organisation, I have turned chiefly to the points directly concerning this latter, certain that opportunities will present themselves for treating the great questions of the day, and thoroughly convinced that it is a direct religious impulse alone that can ensure a really sustained effort in the direction of our intellectual progress, such is the condition of our times, which are most assuredly not favourable to persistence in pursuit of a distant end. Yet this is what Positivism requires.

We have to rise to the level of a very difficult position, and we can keep ourselves at such a level only by feelings and habits. Nor is there any other course open to us in propagating our religion; for pure intellect has but a weak uniting power, as is easily seen when we consider the degree to which the doctrines of Positivism have penetrated, and the repulsion for any common action based on the doctrines which is an accompaniment of their spread.

We should be under no illusion. If we would propagate a new religion in the full sense of the term, we want, if not a certain dose of fanaticism, at least a very large amount of enthusiasm, and the particular difficulty for us Positivists is to reconcile this inherent obligation of a religious movement with the strongly marked scientific character of the doctrine which is its basis. In the overcoming this antagonism consists our emancipation from science, the last and most difficult in the series of emancipations traced by Auguste Comte. It will be attained by following him closely, by reflecting deeply on the course of his thought, and availing ourselves of the landmarks he has left us for tracking the road which lies before us. I have the conviction that those whom I more particularly address will accept the arduous task their religion imposes on them, and will know how to effect the true interdependence of its several constituents.

I end with the expression of my wish that the existing disagreement may be as little of a barrier as possible, that we may all see in it a passing incident which should in no way destroy the fundamental union, nor impair the feeling of fraternity. In certain cases, that feeling has suffered, it is true; but let us not exaggerate the evil. The services both groups can render will be as real after as before the division. We should welcome them with gratitude as given to Humanity, without any scruple as to their source. The rivalry of zeal in her cause is the true means towards our reuniting—a conviction which, I feel sure, prevails in our group, and I am prepared to say, looking to several expressions, is not unshared by the other.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

RELIGION DE L'HUMANITÉ.

RÉPUBLIQUE OCCIDENTALE.

L'AMOUR POUR PRINCIPE
ET L'ORDRE POUR BASE ;
LE PROGRÈS POUR BUT.

VIVRE POUR AUTRI.

VIVRE AU GRAND JOUR.

DEUXIÈME CIRCULAIRE ANNUELLE.

ADRESSÉE À CHAQUE COÖPÉRATEUR DU LIBRE SUB-
SIDE INSTITUÉ PAR AUGUSTE COMTE POUR LE
SACERDOCE DE L'HUMANITÉ.

Londres, le 15 Moïse 92 (15 Janvier, 1880).

La formation du sacerdoce positif devient la première condition d'une régénération non moins indispensable à l'ordre qu'au progrès.

Quoique les positivistes aient dû d'abord monter de la foi vers l'amour, ils doivent désormais préférer la marche plus rapide et plus efficace qui descend de l'amour à la foi.

AUGUSTE COMTE.

MONSIEUR,

La répartition des deux souscriptions, celle de l'année 90 (1878) et celle de l'année 91 (1879) se trouve à la fin de cette circulaire. J'appelle l'attention sur certains points. Sur le total de la première, j'ai versé 1000 frs. au fonds typographique, l'excédant des recettes sur les dépenses à notre début suffisant à ce renforcement d'un moyen si nécessaire à notre action. L'année dernière une petite circulaire a précisé notre action, en ce qui concerne les divers fonds. Désormais donc le fonds typographique doit avoir une existence entièrement distincte. Quant aux frais de gestion ils ont trait, en majeure partie, aux déplacements que nécessite mon action, envers lesquels les ressources personnelles me manquent. Il y a en outre les frais de poste.

Quant à la répartition du subsidé positiviste pour 91 (1879) :—

1° La somme de 650 frs. destinée à l'exécution du testament d'Auguste Comte représente les contributions de deux exécuteurs sur les treize qui constituent le corps des exécuteurs testamentaires. En examinant le compte-rendu de M. Laffitte on verra que pour l'année 1877, l'année qui précède le nouvel ordre des choses, l'exécution réclamait 4183 frs. C'est donc à peu près à 325 frs. que monte la quote-part de chaque exécuter.

2° Fidèle à l'engagement pris dans ma circulaire de 91 (1879) j'ai

versé au subside sacerdotal de M. Laffitte la somme de 1262 frs. 50 cts. afin de compléter le total de 6000 frs., qu'il demande. Nous nous acquittons ainsi d'une obligation imposée par notre passé et nous concilions le concours à un but commun avec l'indépendance que nous a paru exiger l'état actuel du Positivisme.

3° Les 750 frs. affectés aux frais de gestion pour l'année 91 (1879) contre les 375 de l'année précédente s'expliquent par la considération que c'est l'année totale qui est en question; l'autre somme ne concernait que la moitié.

4° En général, la distribution doit manifester à tout homme de bonne foi, combien peu j'ai voulu organiser un groupe exclusivement ou même essentiellement britannique, combien peu les membres de notre groupe sont disposés à rompre la fraternité positiviste ou à se constituer en dehors de l'action française.

5° Le nombre total de souscriptions qu'accusent les deux circulaires, la mienne et celle de M. Laffitte, pourra prêter à une illusion contre laquelle nous devons nous prémunir. Il y aura à en déduire un certain nombre de souscriptions doubles, provenant de ceux qui désirent appuyer l'action positiviste en général et qui regardent les deux groupes comme également incorporés à cette action, travaillant tous les deux à une cause commune.

En conseillant à ses adhérents anglais de se séparer de moi *matériellement et moralement* M. Laffitte a agi dans le sens contraire et stimulé l'opposition déjà assez âpre que je rencontre. En criant au schisme où aucun schisme n'existe, en sanctionnant une espèce d'excommunication peu conforme à l'esprit du Positivisme, il a envenimé la séparation. L'effort directement religieux que j'ai tenté est en lui-même assez ardu. Les positivistes qui le découragent encourent une grave responsabilité vis-à-vis de l'avenir.

Pour les deux groupes qui composent le noyau positiviste occidental il y a eu de part et d'autre accroissement d'activité. En France* les publications du Dr. Audiffrent le démontrent de notre côté, et il m'a été facile de le constater chez les autres. En Angleterre il en est de même. La fête de l'Humanité a été célébrée par deux réunions positivistes à Londres et ce double effort a été prolongé par des cours. Nos réunions religieuses, sauf une courte interruption, ont eu lieu tous les dimanches, ce qui, joint à la commémoration d'Auguste Comte, à la célébration de la Fête des Morts et à l'administration des sacrements, constitue une ébauche, très imparfaite sans doute, mais suivie et sérieuse, du Culte de l'Humanité. Quelles qu'en soient les lacunes, je suis fondé à croire qu'elle agit sur notre monde, non seulement sur les assistants actuels mais sur les absents. On se sent poussé vers le ralliement et le règlement. En dernier lieu, pour ce qui concerne notre action à Londres, une famille prolétaire a demandé pour ses quatre enfants le Sacrement de la Présentation, les deux parents le désirant également; c'est là un grand pas de fait. Il y avait assez de monde à la cérémonie, et des réunions féminines en ont été le résultat indirect mais très-important.

Un autre fait capital c'est la formation à Liverpool d'un nouveau noyau positiviste, le premier qui ait surgi hors de Londres. Et vu la plénitude de conviction religieuse qui caractérise ceux qui sont le centre du ralliement, il y a tout lieu de compter sur la solidité et le progrès de ce mouvement. En somme, je crois pouvoir le dire, nous sommes tous,

* "Lettres sur le Divorce." "au Congrès ouvrier de Marseille," outre deux opuscules médicaux, "Lettres à M. Voisin" et sur les "Mouvements irrésistibles."

français ou anglais, occidentaux ou orientaux, de plus en plus pénétrés de la conviction que c'est par la religion de l'Humanité que nous devons commencer, que c'est une église, si petite, si faible qu'elle soit, qu'il faut constituer. Peut-être que notre dispersion même, si fâcheuse à certains égards, donne de la force à ce sentiment ; des croyants isolés étant par le fait de leur isolement disposés à demander l'appui que fournit seule l'union religieuse. C'est là du moins l'impression que me fait ma correspondance avec mes co-religionnaires épars.

Enfin, la situation générale positiviste s'est améliorée quoique loin d'être satisfaisante. On n'est pas encore parvenu à envisager la modification effectuée dans son vrai jour ; on y arrive, mais lentement. Si on avait pu apporter un peu plus de sang-froid à la considération de ma circulaire initiale, on eût vu que je ne cherchais aucunement à constituer une anti-direction, c'est à dire, une direction analogue à celle qui existait auparavant, mais que j'acceptais la nécessité qui nous imposait une pluralité de groupes, sans trop de dispersion. En même temps, on eût su distinguer entre les différentes phases de la discussion et se convaincre que le manifeste qui le terminait était un nouveau point de départ, d'après un examen fait avec soin de notre passé et de notre avenir, et avec le but nettement indiqué de reprendre en tout la tradition trop méconnue d'Auguste Comte, la tradition franchement religieuse. Malheureusement la lutte antérieure avait accentué les diverses sympathies et antipathies, et la séparation, qu'exigeaient en France et en Angleterre la divergence quant à la méthode et les graves dissidences personnelles, s'est opérée avec une irritation excessive. A un intervalle de dix-huit mois il est temps d'en revenir. Il est certes impossible d'effacer les suites pénibles de la crise. Pour certaines personnes tout raccommodement ne serait qu'un replâtrage. Mais il est bien possible pour la généralité des positivistes d'en atténuer les conséquences en renonçant à tout esprit d'exclusion, en reconnaissant la communauté du but final, en développant la publicité mutuelle en tout ce qui concerne leur action, en combinant enfin une juste indépendance avec une attitude de conciliation.

Tout nous prescrit la plus sage économie de nos forces. Le trouble augmente partout, et la nécessité d'une forte impulsion se fait de plus en plus sentir. Où puiser cette force sinon dans une religion non pas à l'état rudimentaire d'une doctrine, mais constituée en corps et se manifestant par un culte. C'est l'Eglise seule qui soit apte à agir puissamment au milieu du désordre croissant. A quand le commencement ? Question qui se pose surtout pour mes co-religionnaires français. Car tant que le mouvement religieux proprement dit, et sous une forme que tous puissent reconnaître comme ayant ce caractère, n'existe pas en France, le positivisme ne répond pas aux vrais besoins de l'Occident. On a dit qu'il eût été bien difficile de faire ce commencement. La difficulté serait évidemment, à l'heure qu'il est, bien moindre si on eût dirigé dans ce sens l'effort de notre première génération de disciples.

En outre, il faut bien penser aux jeunes, aux enfants, à la nouvelle génération qui doit nous remplacer. Par quels moyens sera-t-elle formée aux habitudes religieuses ? On ne me contestera pas l'importance des premières impressions de l'enfance, et que faisons nous pour les rattacher à notre religion ?

J'abrège, car il suffit de vous soumettre de pareilles considérations, si faciles à développer. D'ailleurs, sur toute cette grande question de la réorganisation religieuse dans ce qu'elle a pour nous de fondamental, je préfère laisser la parole à un autre. Tous me seront reconnaissants d'avoir porté à leur connaissance l'extrait suivant de l'opuscule du

Dr. Audiffrent *Sur les mouvements irrésistibles*, qui a le mérite aussi d'indiquer dans sa plus complète généralité une lacune qui nous regarde tous.

" Nous avons eu l'insigne honneur en notre temps de scepticisme et d'irrésolution de vivre dans l'intimité d'un homme que l'amour de l'Humanité et la contemplation des belles choses avaient porté à la plus sublime abnégation. Cet homme se félicitait d'être né au sein d'une famille catholique, il était de commune extraction. Sa mère, douée d'une prodigieuse activité, était tout amour pour son fils, et en était tendrement aimée. Dès l'âge de treize ans, après un prodigieux développement intellectuel, qui arrêta celui du corps, il dit avoir été émancipé de toutes croyances théologiques. A dix-huit ans, l'adolescent aspire à la régénération sociale. Il appelle bientôt les savants à constituer un sacerdoce nouveau, et proclame que la religion de l'Humanité doit enfin succéder à celle de Dieu. Avec une constance qui défie la misère, il consacre les plus belles années de sa vie à jeter les bases de l'édifice qu'il veut élever. Pour fonder une nouvelle religion et donner au cœur un nouvel aliment, il fallait que l'amour eût régénéré son âme : à cette condition, il aura de grandes inspirations. Il associe une femme à sa mission, par elle son esprit s'illumine d'une soudaine clarté. Malgré la mort, elle reste la compagne de sa vie et son inspiratrice. En elle, il personnifie l'Humanité, et sous ses traits charmants la déesse des humains devient l'objet d'un véritable culte. Son cœur, assisté de son vaste génie, lui révèle alors, d'accord en cela avec ses prédécesseurs d'un autre temps, d'un autre culte, qu'il n'est point d'inspirations soutenues sans pratiques qui rappellent à chaque instant de la vie le but à atteindre, qui tiennent l'âme ouverte à toutes les saintes émotions. La prière devient ainsi pour lui une élévation de l'âme vers tout ce qui est digne d'être aimé. Il faut prier pour aimer, dit-il, c'est l'obligation éternelle de la vie. Il consacre, chaque jour, de longues heures à la prière, il en donne les règles qui coïncident avec celles qu'ont fixées ses prédécesseurs dans l'œuvre de la rédemption humaine.

" L'amour de l'Humanité, qui ne fut jamais poussé aussi loin, a fait de cet homme un saint, en le détachant de tous les stimulants de la personnalité. Est-il nécessaire de dire son nom ? Il nous a prouvé, ce qu'on ne pouvait que soupçonner avant lui, que les nobles sentiments, soutenus par des pratiques de tous les instants, tenant en éveil, par un saint exercice, les grandes inspirations, peuvent, comme le fit jadis l'amour de Dieu, produire des impulsions que rien ne saurait ni ébranler, ni arrêter. Pendant toute une vie traversée par d'intimes souffrances, il se sentit toujours poussé vers l'accomplissement de la mission qu'il s'était donnée : il lui eût été impossible de s'en détourner. Comme Saint-Paul il s'est trouvé libre dans la règle, il l'a aimée et recherchée ; comme lui, il a impérieusement senti l'aiguillon du devoir, comme lui il a cru avoir charge d'âmes. Les disciples à qui il a confié la continuation de son œuvre ont cru pouvoir se passer des pratiques auxquelles s'était soumis leur maître. Aussi sont-ils restés sans ardeur et sans inspirations. Après vingt ans d'infructueux efforts, ils marquent encore le pas à la suite de la tourbe qui continue à se révolter contre les plus salutaires préjugés, quand tout réclame autour d'eux une direction. La foi qui vivifie n'a fait qu'effleurer leur esprit, elle n'a jamais touché leur cœur. Ce n'est pas avec vos combinaisons politiques, avec vos prétendants de toutes nuances que vous régénérerez le monde, disait naguère un jeune ecclésiastique qui, comme ses pareils, connaissait les mérites de la prière : il faut des saints pour une pareille œuvre. Le Positivisme attend encore les siens. Voilà le secret du temps d'arrêt qu'il semble subir en ce moment."

Aux paroles du Docteur Audiffrent je n'ai qu'un mot à ajouter. Elles nous indiquent notre lacune fondamentale à tous. C'est que disciples et apôtres d'une nouvelle religion nous nous sommes peu efforcés de devenir des hommes religieux. Sans nous excuser de n'avoir pas marché dans la bonne voie, il faut cependant reconnaître que la véritable tradition d'Auguste Comte n'a pas été connue autant qu'elle devait l'être, grâce aux obstacles qui ont empêché la publication de son testament aussi bien que d'autres écrits sur lesquels il comptait beaucoup. En effet le testament d'Auguste Comte reste essentiellement inexécuté sous ce rapport et par suite l'ordonnance religieuse de sa vie inconnue ou tout au plus imparfaitement connue. Ceci peut expliquer à un certain degré notre état défectueux, et l'importance relative que nous avons attachée à la partie sociologique de son œuvre en insistant trop peu sur la partie morale et religieuse. Les publications indiquées eussent modifié, il y'a toute raison de le croire, la situation, en nous associant à sa vie intime et en nous animant de l'inspiration religieuse qui la dominait avec une intensité croissante. Mis directement en présence de ses dernières pensées nous ne serions pas restés si au-dessous de notre grande tâche. Il est à espérer que sans trop de délai nous trouverons à remédier à ce défaut involontaire.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

Subside positiviste.

Souscriptions totales pour l'année 90 (1878) 3891 fr. 25 c.

Résumé des Dépenses pour l'année 90 (1878).

Subvention à M. Couché	500 fr.
Frais de gestion	375 fr.
Fonds typographique	1000 fr.
Total	1875 fr.
	2016 fr. 25 c.
à rapporter sur l'exercice de 91 (1879), 2016 fr. 25 c.	3891 fr. 25 c.

Résumé général des souscriptions pour l'année 91 (1879).

		(Minimum ...	5 fr.
11 françaises.....	455 fr. 00 c.	Moyenne ...	41 fr. 37 c.
		(Maximum... ..	100 fr.
59 occidentales...	5892 fr. 50 c.	(Minimum ...	1 fr. 25 c.
		Moyenne ...	99 fr. 87 c.
		(Maximum... ..	1250 fr.
2 orientales.....	152 fr. 50 c.		
Total 72	6500 fr.		
à ajouter...	2016 fr. 25 c.		
	8516 fr. 25 c.		

Résumé des dépenses pour l'année 91 (1879).

1 ^o Contribution à l'exécution du Testament d'Auguste Comte	650 fr.
2 ^o Subside sacerdotal à M. Audiffrent	1500 fr.
3 ^o Subside sacerdotal à M. Pierre Laffitte	1262 fr. 50 c.
4 ^o Subvention à M. Couché	1200 fr.
5 ^o Frais de gestion, déplacement, &c.	750 fr.
Total.....	5362 fr. 50 c.
	3153 fr. 75 c.
à rapporter 3153 fr. 75	8516 fr. 25 c.

[The English equivalent.]

SIR,

On the page opposite are the details of the administration of the Sacerdotal Fund, for 90 and 91, (1878 and 1879). There are some points to which I would call your attention. As in our first year there was a surplus sufficient for the purpose, I allotted £40 to the Printing Fund, so indispensable to our action. I explained in a short circular last year the distinction between the several funds; for the future the Printing Fund must be kept quite distinct. The expenses of administration mainly concern the journeys which I find necessary, for which my own means are insufficient. There are also postal expenses to be taken in.

As for 91 (1879):—

1. The sum of £26, set apart for the execution of Auguste Comte's will, represents the contributions of two out of the 13 executors. On examination of M. Laffitte's statement,—I take the year 89 (1877) as anterior to the actual state of things,—you will find that this object took 4183 frs. (£167 7s. 6d.); £13 is therefore about the share of each executor.

2. In fulfilment of the engagement I took in my circular for 91 (1879). I paid towards M. Laffitte's sacerdotal subsidy £50 10s., in order to make up the £240 (6000 frs.), which he asks for. We thus discharge an obligation resulting from the past, and we reconcile our co-operation to a common end with the independence which the existing conditions of Positivism seemed to us to render necessary.

3. In taking £30 (750 frs.), as against £15 in the preceding year for the expenses of management, I would remind you that it is the whole year in one case, in the other only the half, which is concerned.

4. Generally, the distribution of our fund should make it clear to every fair mind that I have in no sense a wish to form an exclusively or even essentially English group, and that the members of our group are in no way disposed to break off from the brotherhood of Positivists or to aim at a separate existence apart from the action of France.

5. We must guard against an erroneous inference from the sum total of subscribers as indicated by the two circulars, mine and M. Laffitte's. We must allow for those who subscribe to both funds, as wishing to support the general Positivist action, and looking on both groups as parts of one whole, both labouring in a common cause.

By his advice to his English adherents to separate themselves from me, *materially and morally*, M. Laffitte acts in the opposite direction, and

has encouraged the opposition which I meet with. It was bitter enough without such a stimulus. By his cry of schism, when there is no schism, by his sanction of a kind of excommunication, little in keeping with the spirit of Positivism, he has infused venom into the rupture. My effort to constitute a religious movement is difficult enough in itself. A serious responsibility rests on those Positivists who discourage it, for they compromise the future.

In both the groups which form the Western nucleus there has been an increase of activity. In France this is shown by the publications of Dr. Audiffrent on our part, and it was easy for me to see that it existed on the other side. It is the same in England. The Festival of Humanity was kept in London by two Positivist meetings, and this twofold effort has been continued in courses of lectures. Our own religious meetings, with a short interval, have been continued on the Sundays throughout the year. Add to this the commemoration of Auguste Comte, the celebration of the Festival of all the Dead, and the Administration of Sacraments, and you have the beginnings of a Worship of Humanity, in an imperfect, rudimentary state, no doubt, but yet with the character of a continuous and serious effort. Whatever its deficiencies, I have reason to think that it has an effect on our body, not merely on those who are present, but on the absent members. All feel impelled to union and to the government of their lives.

Lastly, in regard to London, a proletary family requested for the four children, both parents in entire agreement as to the wish, the sacrament of Presentation. This is a great step. The attendance was fairly large, and led indirectly to a most important result, viz., other meetings of Positivist women.

Another very important fact is the formation in Liverpool of a new Positivist centre, the first organised out of London. We may confidently expect the movement to be sustained and to grow, as it rests on the solid foundation of full religious convictions in those who form the rallying point. On the whole, then, I think I am warranted in saying, that we are all, French or English, Western or Eastern, deeply convinced that it is the Religion of Humanity with which we must begin, that it is a Church, however small and weak it may be at present, which we must begin by forming. Possibly our very dispersion, on many grounds an evil, may strengthen this conviction, isolated believers being, by the very fact of their isolation, led to seek the support which a religious union alone can give. Such at least is the impression left on me by my correspondence with our scattered co-religionists.

In general, Positivism is in a better state, though there is much yet to be desired. The change introduced is scarcely even yet seen in its right light. This will come, but slowly. Had my original circular been more coolly examined, it would have been seen that I in no way aimed at constituting an anti-direction, a direction of the same kind as the previous one; that I fully accepted the necessity of having more than one group, but without any excess of disaggregation. Again it would have been possible to see the distinction between the different periods of the discussion, and to recognise that the manifesto in which it ended was a new departure, a step taken after a careful examination of the past and immediate future of the Positivist movement, and with a clearly defined object, viz.: to return on all points to the tradition of Auguste Comte, which had been unduly obscured,—the directly religious tradition.

Unhappily the contest had intensified our various sympathies and antipathies, and the separation which was a necessity both in France

and England, owing to our disagreement as to method, and our serious personal differences, was accompanied with an excess of irritation. It is not possible to do away altogether with the painful results of the crisis. For some of us no return could be anything but hollow. But taking the body as a whole, much might be done to lessen the evil, if we gave up all tendency to exclusion, if we acknowledged the community of purpose, if on both sides we gave full publicity to the action of both, in a word, if we combined a fair independence with a conciliatory bearing.

Everything enjoins on us to economise our strength. The disorder of the world is on the increase, the need of a strong impulse is more and more felt. Where is the strength to come from except from a religion? and from a religion not in the rudimentary state of a mere doctrine, but taking shape in a body of worshippers, and manifesting itself by a worship. Nothing but a Church can act with power in the midst of this growing disorder. When are we to have the beginning of it? This is a question which more peculiarly concerns the French Positivists. For so long as the religious movement, strictly so called, and in a form which all can recognise as presenting the characteristic features of a religious movement, does not exist in France, Positivism does not meet the real wants of the West. It has been said that it would have been very difficult to begin. Evidently the difficulty would at the present time be much less, had the efforts of the first generation of disciples been guided in this direction.

More than this, we must take into our consideration the young, the children, the new generation which is to take our place. By what means will it be trained to religious habits? The importance of the earliest impressions of childhood will not be denied, and what is being done to connect them with our religion?

I speak shortly, for it is enough to lay before you hints on such subjects—hints which are easy to expand. And moreover on this whole question of religious reorganisation, under its most fundamental aspect, I prefer to let another speak. All will be grateful to me for bringing before them the following extract from the work of Dr. Audiffrent on *Irresistible Movements*, an extract which is also valuable on this account that it states in the most general form a want which concerns all of us without exception.

'We have had in these days of scepticism and indecision the high honour of living on intimate terms with one who by the love of Humanity and the contemplation of noble things, had risen to the most sublime self-abnegation. He thought that he had been fortunate in being born of a Catholic family—his parents were quite of the middle class. His mother, a woman of very great activity, was full of love for her son, and was tenderly beloved by him. At the age of thirteen, after a remarkable development of the intellect which arrested his bodily growth, he says that he was emancipated from all theological belief. At eighteen the young man forms the aspiration after a social regeneration. Not long after, he appeals to the savants to form a new priesthood, and announces that the religion of Humanity must take the place of that of God. Firmly confronting poverty, he devotes the best years of his life to lay the foundation of the edifice he wishes to raise. To found a new religion and give the heart a new sustenance, what was wanted was that love should regenerate his being. This condition fulfilled, he will have great inspirations. He makes a woman the partner of his mission; through her a sudden brightness lights up his intellect: she dies, but she remains the companion of his life and the

source of his inspiration. In her he personifies Humanity, and under her beautiful features the goddess of men becomes the object of a real worship. His heart aided by his vast genius leads him to see, in agreement therein with his predecessors of another time and of a different cultus, that all sustained inspiration must rest on exercises which recall at every moment of life the end to be attained and keep the soul open to all holy emotions. Thus prayer becomes for him a raising of the soul towards all that is worthy of love. 'We must pray if we are to love,' says he, 'it is the eternal obligation of life.' He sets apart each day long hours for prayer, he gives rules for it, rules which are in entire agreement with those laid down by his predecessors in the work of human redemption.

'The love of Humanity, which was never carried so far, made this man a saint, and set him free from all the incitements of personality. Need I name him? He has proved to us, what could only be suspected before him, that noble sentiments, upheld by constant religious exercises and so keeping awake by a holy practice great inspirations, are able, as the love of God of old was able, to give birth to impulses which nothing can shake or stop. During a whole life, marred by great private suffering, he found himself constantly driven on to the accomplishment of his self-imposed task; it would have been an impossibility for him to swerve from it. With St. Paul, he found freedom in law, he loved and sought for a rule of life; with St. Paul he felt the imperative stimulus of duty; with St. Paul, he considered himself to have the charge of souls. The disciples to whom he entrusted the carrying on of his work have thought that they could do without the practices to which their master submitted, and therefore it is that they have been without ardour and without inspirations. After twenty years of efforts without much fruit they are still beating time in the rear of the crowd which persists in its revolt against the most wholesome prejudices, and that at a period when everything is calling for a direction. The faith which gives life has only touched the surface of their intellect, never sunk into their heart. 'It is not with your political combinations, with your pretenders of all sorts, that you will regenerate the world,' said lately a young priest, who as the rest of his order, knew the value of prayer, 'Saints are needed for such a work.' The saints of Positivism are not yet forthcoming. This is the secret of the arrest in development to which at the present moment it seems subject.'

To these words of Dr. Audiffrent I have but to add, that they point to one fundamental defect. As disciples and apostles of a new religion we have made but slight efforts to become religious. Without offering any excuse for this error, we may yet allow that the true tradition of Auguste Comte has not been known as it should have been, owing to the obstacles which have hindered the publication of his will as of other writings on which he relied greatly. His will is in fact not executed in this respect, and consequently the religious ordering of his life remains unknown, or at most, imperfectly known. This may in a degree explain our defect and the relative importance we have attached to the social portion of his work, whilst laying too little stress on its moral and religious portions. The publications alluded to would probably have altered matters by associating us with his inner life and by animating us with the religious impulse which swayed it with an ever increasing intensity. Brought face to face with his last thoughts we should not have remained so inferior to our great task. It were much to be wished that this involuntary omission may soon be supplied.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

RELIGION DE L'HUMANITE.

RÉPUBLIQUE OCCIDENTALE.

L'AMOUR POUR PRINCIPE
ET L'ORDRE POUR BASE;
LE PROGRÈS POUR BUT.

VIVRE POUR AUTRUI.

VIVRE AU GRAND JOUR.

TROISIÈME CIRCULAIRE ANNUELLE

ADRESSÉE À CHAQUE COÖPÉRATEUR DU LIBRE SUB-
SIDE INSTITUÉ PAR AUGUSTE COMTE POUR LE
SACERDOCE DE L'HUMANITÉ.

Londres, le 15 Moïse 93 (15 Janvier, 1881).

La formation du sacerdoce positif devient la première condition d'une
régénération non moins indispensable à l'ordre qu'au progrès.
Quoique les positivistes aient dû d'abord monter de la foi vers l'amour,
ils doivent désormais préférer la marche plus rapide et plus efficace qui
descend de l'amour à la foi.

AUGUSTE COMTE.

MONSIEUR,

Le compte-rendu de notre situation financière se trouve à la fin de cette circulaire. On y verra, en premier lieu, la distribution de l'excédant qui restait sur l'exercice de 91 (1879); en second lieu, le tableau de nos recettes et dépenses pour l'année qui vient de finir. Il y a progrès et dans le nombre et dans le chiffre des cotisations, en France aussi bien qu'ailleurs. En général cependant le subside repose trop sur un petit nombre de souscripteurs, et nous devons nous efforcer à lui donner une plus large base.

Notre groupe a cessé d'après le désir de M. Laffitte de contribuer à son subside sacerdotal. Ma correspondance avec lui explique cette démarche. Je ne souscris plus que pour la forme à l'exécution du testament. Ce changement est motivé par le refus de M. Laffitte, en contravention formelle, à mon avis, avec le testament d'Auguste Comte, de me donner accès à la bibliothèque du testateur, et à ses papiers. Je passe légèrement sur cet incident. Le refus a été suspensif, mais, grâce à M. Lonchamp j'ai appris que la décision de la réunion des exécuteurs testamentaires au mois de Septembre le rendait essentiellement définitif. Une lettre à M. Laffitte est restée sans réponse.

Cette année, comme la dernière, c'est toujours à l'appui de notre centre français que nous consacrons notre effort principal. Il lui fallait un domicile, comme siège matériel de son activité. Un appartement, 30 Rue Jacob, a été loué dans ce but, et le subside de l'année

précédente (91), a pourvu aux frais de l'installation ; ceux du loyer et des dépenses courantes étant à la charge du revenu de 92 (1880). Nous avons pu aussi contribuer à la rénovation de notre salle à Londres, et à l'installation de celle de Liverpool. En attendant que les occasions se présentent d'une application plus personnelle, nous ne pouvons faire un emploi plus utile de nos ressources qu'en aidant à l'établissement de nouveaux centres, qui ne tarderont pas à surgir, d'après l'exemple de Liverpool, suivi dernièrement par Birmingham. Un tel appui peut parfaitement se concilier avec une grande liberté d'action, condition imposée par notre milieu et conforme à l'esprit du positivisme, où le concours reste volontaire. Chaque nouvelle organisation jugera à quel degré il doit être effectif.

La salle 30 Rue Jacob a été inaugurée le 18 St. Paul 92 (Dimanche, 6 Juin) par un discours dans lequel j'ai exposé l'ensemble de sa destination tel que je le concevais. Elle devait nous servir de siège social, centre de nos communications et de notre action. Réunions fraternelles, dépôt des publications positivistes, bibliothèque positiviste, tout cela en faisait partie. Enfin et surtout il devait s'y tenir aussi régulièrement que possible des réunions ayant un caractère franchement religieux, quelle que fût la forme qu'on se décidât à leur donner, complétées, de toute nécessité, le cas échéant, par l'administration des sacrements de la religion positive, les consécérations qui accompagnent d'une manière ou d'une autre toute société religieuse.

La constitution de ce nouveau siège a eu son utilité. Il en est sorti deux publications d'une grande valeur, d'abord *La protestation contre les décrets*, signée par les Drs. Audiffrent et Sémérie, et puis *Le Positivisme des derniers temps*, quatre discours par le Dr. Audiffrent. Ajoutez la *Politique républicaine à propos de l'article 7, lettre à M. Clémenceau par le Dr. Sémérie*, publication antérieure à notre installation, et on pourra se convaincre que, sauf des réserves quant à quelques particularités de forme, l'action de notre groupe en France a été salutaire. Il a revendiqué pour le Positivisme l'indépendance spirituelle qu'un silence trop opportuniste quant à la loi Ferry et à l'oppression des congrégations religieuses eut gravement compromise, et il nous a remis dans la vraie voie religieuse par l'affirmation plus directe de la tradition d'Auguste Comte.

J'accepte donc avec reconnaissance les résultats positifs de notre action à Paris. Mais, d'accord en cela avec le Dr. Audiffrent, le concours des deux éléments qui constituent le groupe doit être dorénavant sur le pied d'une plus grande indépendance réciproque. Dans tout ce que je dirai à cet égard je me placerai à la fin de l'année sans me laisser influencer par ce qui se passe actuellement ; je pose la situation, c'est à dire, telle qu'elle existait au commencement de Moise 93 (Janvier, 1881), et sans faire des prévisions quant à notre marche ultérieure. De ce point de vue je dis, qu'il y a toujours eu, comme je l'ai reconnu du reste à plusieurs reprises, un certain désaccord entre ma manière de voir et celle de mes honorables confrères parisiens, quant à la méthode de propagande à adopter. Il y a eu aussi une différence d'allure qui se caractérise dans la partie négative de nos diverses publications. Il en est résulté des divergences et des discussions que l'absence d'une langue commune rend très difficiles, en nous imposant, à moi surtout, un surcroît d'embarras souvent assez pénible.

La divergence principale porte sur la propagande religieuse. En prenant au mois d'Octobre la direction à Paris, le Dr. Audiffrent a jugé nécessaire, après une courte expérience, de modifier le programme que j'avais tracé et par conséquent la destination essentielle que j'avais

assignée à la salle. Sans insister sur cette différence, sans contester la décision de mes confrères français, je vois avec eux qu'il est urgent de nous assurer le maximum d'indépendance en dégagant aussi complètement que nos conditions préalables nous le permettent notre responsabilité mutuelle, et cela dans les deux sens également, pour l'action, aussi bien que pour les écrits, en ne cessant de concourir au but commun. Parlant au nom de ceux de mes coreligionnaires occidentaux dont je centralise l'action, nous continuerons à appuyer le positivisme et les positivistes français partout où ils se trouvent, et surtout ceux d'entre eux avec qui nous avons été dans ces derniers temps plus intimement liés, fidèles à notre passé qui nous a vus constamment attachés à la France, mais en conservant notre liberté d'action et en suivant notre méthode de propagande.

Je ne reviens pas sur ma dernière circulaire. À mes yeux la situation reste la même, le besoin d'une organisation religieuse tout aussi impératif, et je n'ai rien à changer quant à la manière dont j'envisage son commencement. Tenant peu à une forme précise quelconque je vise l'essentiel, la formation, c'est-à-dire, par l'agrégation d'individus, d'une Église, si petite, si modeste, qu'elle puisse être, mais enfin d'un corps de fidèles, d'une société ayant aux yeux de tous, et surtout aux yeux des pratiquants de l'ancienne foi, le caractère d'une association basée sur des besoins et des sentiments religieux, rallié par un service commun et tendant graduellement à l'ébauche d'un culte qui en serait l'expression visible. Or ce n'est pas là la manière de voir de mes collègues français. Ils croient à quelque chose de moins pénible et plus rapide. J'espère que les événements leur donneront raison, mais en tout cas, on ne perdra rien en commençant autrement, et au moment du succès ce ne sera pas un mal que d'avoir sous la main un groupe d'hommes formés à l'école de la patience et de la persistance, au milieu du découragement et du ridicule qui accompagnent infailliblement à son début la propagation d'une nouvelle foi. On ne me contestera pas que c'est grâce à cette méthode que nous avons pu marcher jusqu'à présent. Un avenir plus brillant nous attend—je le veux bien—mais il ne sera sûr qu'en tant qu'il s'appuie sur une pareille formation. Je doute qu'on arrive à la créer de toutes pièces. N'est-ce pas là du reste ce que voulait dire Auguste Comte quand il posait comme condition du culte public l'existence d'un corps de positivistes ayant institué le culte intime ?

À Londres nous continuons avec plus de suite et avec certaines additions notre action antérieure. La fête de l'Humanité, la fête universelle des morts, celle des Saintes Femmes, voilà pour les fêtes de l'année. Comme elle était bissextile, la commémoration d'Auguste Comte a eu lieu selon le calendrier positiviste le 24 Gutenberg, le 4 Septembre. Les sacrements de l'*admission* et de la *destination* ont été conférés, outre quelques cérémonies supplémentaires. Tous les Dimanches en règle générale il y a réunion sous l'invocation de l'Humanité avec de courtes lectures, des prières, et un discours. C'est très simple, faisant face aux exigences les plus urgentes, servant de ralliement, préparant les âmes au culte privé et destiné à inspirer le désir du vrai culte public. Rattachant l'Ecole positiviste à l'Église de l'Humanité, nous pratiquons en proportion de nos moyens notre religion au milieu d'une population à la fois sceptique et croyante, qui nous conteste la possibilité de rien constituer en dehors des idées théologiques. Regardant la discussion comme inutile, nous nous mettons à l'œuvre et j'ai la conviction que notre résolution profitera à la cause commune. Si j'en parle c'est afin de prévenir les malentendus. En principe la même

chose se fait à Liverpool, et il y a à Birmingham un acheminement vers le même résultat. Qu'est ce qui empêche un effort analogue en France ou partout ailleurs où il se trouvera des positivistes en nombre suffisant ?

Du reste il y a cet avantage que l'action dans ce sens est toujours possible sous tous les régimes et rien n'empêche de la concilier avec tout effort sérieux, quelle qu'en soit la nature, ayant pour but l'avancement de la religion universelle.

Seulement il est à désirer, vu cette dissidence et ce besoin d'indépendance, que nos confrères parisiens arrivent à se suffire à eux-mêmes quant au maintien de leur local, afin que de notre côté toute responsabilité cesse quant à l'emploi d'un instrument que nous leur fournissons. Alors toute divergence secondaire perdrait sa gravité. Tant que nous y sommes engagés au degré où nous le sommes il est nécessaire qu'un certain contrôle nous revienne, ce qui rend la position très difficile. D'ailleurs en nous séparant amicalement toute complication pécuniaire disparaîtrait, considération d'une haute importance.

Dans l'Inde aussi bien qu'en Amérique—je parle des États-Unis—les positivistes avec qui je suis en relation sont trop dispersés pour donner autre chose que leur appui personnel, qui n'a pas fait défaut. Cette dispersion s'est aggravée cette année quant à l'Inde, mais néanmoins l'effort persiste tant parmi les indigènes que les Européens. L'isolement pèse mais ne décourage pas. Aucun pays n'a autant besoin de notre doctrine consolante et fortifiante, qui convient également aux gouvernés et aux gouvernants, sauf une différence d'application, bien entendu. Aux États-Unis il n'est pas permis de douter que les idées positivistes ne deviennent petit à petit plus puissantes, et que le nombre de ceux qui les acceptent n'augmente, mais là comme ailleurs c'est une forte impulsion qui manque, provenant d'un centre bien constitué. En attendant qu'il surgisse, nous devons nous contenter de saisir toutes les occasions qui se présentent pour nous rapprocher et combiner nos efforts en accueillant avec reconnaissance tout témoignage de bienveillance. Dans les autres pays de l'Occident on est encore trop à l'attente. En Italie cependant, certaines indications nous permettent d'espérer que la doctrine régénératrice trouvera des adhérents, peut-être en a-t-elle déjà trouvés. La discussion depuis longtemps engagée aboutira à des convictions.

Avec une certaine réserve indiquée ci-dessus je me fais un devoir de reconnaître les services rendus par nos coreligionnaires occidentaux groupés autour de M. Laffitte. On l'a bien dit, il n'y a pas plusieurs positivismes, il y a des positivistes à différents degrés. L'union fondamentale se fait sentir à l'heure de la mort. Nous avons éprouvé de grandes pertes cette année de part et d'autre. Nous nous associons au regret qu'inspire à ses amis la mort prématurée de M. Mahy, à qui l'avenir semblait réserver une carrière si utile. Et je me plais à reconnaître que cette communauté de sympathie a été admise par M. Laffitte dans une occasion pareille qui nous regardait plus spécialement. Est-il besoin de nommer M. Geddes ?

L'abattement que nous causent de telles pertes ne doit pourtant pas nous faire douter que le positivisme ne marche. Ses vingt-cinq années d'existence n'ont pas été sans fruit, il s'agit d'en profiter. Le trouble qui nous environne n'admet d'autre remède que celui qui nous est confié, sous quelque aspect qu'on envisage le désordre. Je prends pour exemple ce concert Européen dont il a été tant question derièrement et qui n'aboutit pas, vu l'absence de la seule base solide, une foi commune qui lui serve de ralliement et de guide.

Toute autre base est insuffisante et précaire. La diplomatie, la saine

politique, peuvent beaucoup sans doute comme palliatifs, la religion seule est un remède. Celle qui domine officiellement étant reconnue inefficace, la vraie question est celle-ci, comment propager la nouvelle qui doit la remplacer. La réponse n'est pas loin de nous. Auguste Comte nous l'a donnée. C'est par le culte systématique de l'Humanité. Notre pré-occupation doit donc être son installation. Elle ne gênera en rien notre activité spéciale.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

Subside positiviste.

Report de l'année 91 (1879)	3153 fr. 75 c.
Frais d'ameublement de l'appartement, 30 Rue Jacob	1900 fr.
Donné à la salle de Liverpool	250 fr.
Rénovation, &c., de celle de Londres.....	747 fr.
La Circulaire de l' an 90	136 fr.
Total	3033 fr.
Reste	120 fr. 75 c.

Résumé général des souscriptions pour l'année 92 (1880).

15 françaises.....	687 fr. 50 c.	{ Minimum ...	5 fr.
		{ Moyenne ...	45 fr. 83 c.
		{ Maximum...	250 fr.
71 occidentales...	7562 fr. 75 c.	{ Minimum ...	25 fr.
		{ Moyenne ...	106 fr. 50 c.
		{ Maximum...	1250 fr.
3 orientales.....	124 fr.	{ Minimum ...	7 fr. 50 c.
		{ Moyenne ...	41 fr. 33 c.
		{ Maximum...	104 fr. 20 c.
Total 89	8374 fr. 25 c.		
à ajouter...	120 fr. 75 c.		

Résumé des Dépenses pour l'année 92 (1881).

1 ^o Exécution du Testament	10 fr.
2 ^o Subside sacerdotal et subvention à M. Audiffrent	1920 fr.
3 ^o Subvention à M. Couché	1500 fr.
4 ^o 30 Rue Jacob, Loyer et Garde	1280 fr. 65 c.
5 ^o Circulaire et frais	150 fr.
6 ^o Frais de gestion, déplacement, &c.	750 fr.
Total.....	5610 fr. 65 c.
	2884 fr. 35 c.

8495 fr.

à reporter sur l'exercice de 93 (1881), 2884 fr. 35 c.

[*The English equivalent.*]

SIR,

On the page preceding you will find the statement of our accounts. First comes the employment of the surplus of the year 91 (1879), then the receipts and expenses of the past year. The number of subscribers, and the amount of subscriptions, both show an increase, in France as elsewhere. Still the fund rests too much on a small number of subscribers, and our efforts should be directed to give it greater security by enlarging its base.

In accordance with M. Lafitte's wish we no longer contribute to his personal maintenance, as was explained in my correspondence with him. I give this year only a formal subscription to the execution of the will of Auguste Comte—a change justified by the refusal of M. Lafitte, in direct opposition as I think with that will, to allow me access to the books and papers of the testator. I will say but little on the matter. The refusal was provisional; but I learn from M. Lonchampt that at the meeting of the executors in September it was in effect made definitive. A letter I wrote to M. Lafitte was not answered.

This year, as last, our main exertion has been in support of the French constituent of our group. It felt the need of a room at its disposal whence it might exert its action. An apartment, 30 Rue Jacob, was taken, and the expense of furnishing it met from the surplus above-mentioned: the rent and current expenses being defrayed by the income of the year. From the same surplus came also a contribution to the repairs and embellishment of our room in London, and a subscription to the one at Liverpool. There will come, we may hope, demands for a more personal application of our funds, but meanwhile we cannot employ them more usefully than in promoting the establishment of new centres, as at Liverpool, and recently at Birmingham. Such support need in no way interfere with the full liberty of action which all our environment makes a necessary condition of co-operation, and which is, moreover, in accordance with the spirit of Positivism, concert being always voluntary. Each new organisation will judge of the degree to which it should carry its co-operation.

The room in Paris was inaugurated the 18th St. Paul (6 June, 1880). In my opening discourse I set forth in full the objects, as I conceived them, which it was meant to secure. It was to be the seat of our social action and a centre for our communication. Friendly meetings, the dépôt of Positivist publications, a Positivist library, were all parts of the plan; but, above all, there were to be held there as regularly as was attainable meetings with a directly religious character, whatever form it might be found advisable to give them. Finally, the sacraments of the Positive religion were, when required, to be conferred there, no religious society being able to dispense with certain consecrations.

This new centre has been useful. There have been issued two documents of great value: (1). *The Protest against the Decrees*, with the signatures of Drs. Audiffrent and Sémérie. (2). *Positivism in the immediate past*, four discourses by Dr. Audiffrent. I add to this list, though it was of an earlier date, *The Republican Policy as regards Article 7*, a letter to M. Clémenceau, by Dr. Sémérie. These suffice to show (reserving certain special points of form), that the action of our group in France has been very useful. It has vindicated the spiritual independence of Positivism, seriously compromised by the silence of others

in too opportunist a spirit. It has further brought us back to the true religious course, by its more open assertion of the traditions of Auguste Comte.

I am grateful then for the positive results of our action in Paris. But I agree with Dr. Audiffrent in thinking that the two constituents of the group must for the future be more distinctly independent of one another, co-operating on the footing of mutual freedom. In what I say on this point I place myself at the end of the year 92, not allowing any incidents of the current year to influence my statements. I speak of matters as they were on the 1st of Moses 93 (1 January, 1881), without forecasting the future. I say, then, that there has always been, as I have more than once acknowledged, a certain disagreement as to the method of propaganda between me and my Parisian colleagues. There has also been a difference in the forms of our procedure, which is easily traceable in the more negative part of our several publications. As a result there have been discussions, the difficulty of which is great, owing to the want of a common language, a source to me especially of very painful embarrassment.

The chief point on which we are at issue is the religious propaganda. Dr. Audiffrent, on taking the direction in Paris last October, after a short time judged it necessary to alter the programme I had sketched, and, consequently, that which I had regarded as the most important object of the room. Without dwelling on this difference, without disputing the decision arrived at, I see, as my colleagues in Paris see, that it is imperative to secure the maximum of independence, so as to clear ourselves, each of us, of all common responsibility, so far as our antecedents allow. And this both in regard to our action and our respective publications, without ceasing however to co-operate towards the common end. Speaking for my Western co-religionists, whose action I centralise, we shall continue to support Positivism and the French Positivists wherever they are found, and especially those of them with whom of late we have been most closely connected. We have ever been desirous of attaching ourselves to France, and we shall remain faithful to our past, but we must keep our freedom of action and abide by our own methods of propagating our faith.

The state of affairs generally is much the same as it was when I wrote my last circular, the need of a religious organisation quite as imperious, nor do I see any reason to change my conception of the manner in which it must begin. I attach no importance to any special form, I look to the essential point, which is the formation by individual aggregation of a church—small and humble it may be at first—of a body of believers, a society which for all, and especially for those who are active members of the older churches, shall have the character of an association resting on a community of religious wants and feelings, brought together in a common service, and tending to the gradual institution, in a rudimentary form, of the cultus which is to be its outward expression. Now this is not the way in which my French colleagues look at the matter. They believe in a more rapid, less painful process. I hope they will be justified by the event—but meanwhile nothing would be lost if we began as above, and when their success comes it will be no harm to have a body of believers formed in the school of patient and persistent effort in the face of discouragement and ridicule, the inevitable accompaniments of the earlier years of a new faith. One thing will hardly be denied, that it is owing to this method that Positivism has been enabled to exist hitherto as an organised movement. A brighter future awaits us. I quite hope so—but its brightness will be

brief unless it rests on some such formation. I doubt its springing into existence fullgrown. Is not this the meaning of Auguste Comte when he laid it down as the condition of public worship, that there should be a body of Positivists living in the practice of private prayer?

In London we go on as before, if with greater regularity and with some additions. The Festival of Humanity, with those of All the Dead and of Holy Women—such were the festivals of the year. In accordance with the Positivist Calendar, as the year was Leap Year, we kept the Commemoration of our Founder on the 24th Gutenberg (4th September). The Sacraments of *Admission* and *Destination* with some supplementary ceremonies have been administered. As a rule we have had meetings on the Sunday. What we do is very simple; we wish to meet pressing wants, to collect the members of our body, to lead them to the practice of private worship with the further aim of implanting the desire for the fuller worship of the future. We have placed the Positivist school in connection with the Church of Humanity, and in it, with due regard to our means, we perform our religious service, in the midst of a population which is divided between scepticism and belief, but which in either case declares it impossible for us to organise a religion without any theological basis. Convinced that discussion is useless, we have set to work, and I make no doubt that our determination will be of use to the cause. I have spoken of it in order to prevent misconceptions. The movement at Liverpool has essentially the same character; and at Birmingham the first steps have been taken towards an analogous result. What prevents a similar effort being made in France, or wherever there exists a sufficient body of Positivists? There is this advantage in our plan, that it is possible at all times and under all governments, and it is easily combined with all other forms of exertion, the aim of which is the furtherance of the Religion of Humanity.

But as there is disagreement, and a consequent necessity for independence, it is very desirable that the Parisian movement should become self-supporting, so that the maintenance of their room may involve us in no responsibility for their use of an instrument which we provide. All secondary differences would then lose their importance. Whilst we are involved to our present extent, it is but right that we should have some voice in the management, and this is a source of real difficulty. Add to this that with a friendly separation all money complications would cease—a consideration of great importance.

In India as well as in America—I mean in the United States—the Positivists with whom I am in connection are too dispersed to admit of their contributing more than their personal support. The dispersion has been greater this year than ever as far as concerns India, still the work goes on among the Hindoos as among the Europeans. Their isolation may press on them, but it does not discourage. No country stands more in need of the consoling and strengthening influence of our religion, which, if with a natural difference, is yet equally available for the governed and the governors. We cannot doubt but that in the United States the ideas of Positivism are gradually gaining power, the numbers of those who accept them are on the increase; but there, as everywhere, a strong impulsion is wanted—the impact of a well-constituted centre. Till such centre is formed we must be content with seizing all opportunities for union and combination of effort, welcoming with gratitude all kindly advances. In the other countries of the West there is too general a disposition to wait. Yet in Italy, however, there are grounds for hoping that the regenerating faith will gain adherents—possibly has

already gained some. The discussion which has been long going on will end in convictions.

I have intimated a certain reservation in regard to the services rendered our cause by the group which centres in M. Laffitte, but I consider it a duty to bear witness to those services. It has been well said that there are not several Positivisms, but a number of Positivists at different stages. The underlying union is felt in the hour of death, and death has been busy amongst us all this last year. We join in the regret felt by his friends for the loss of M. Mahy, whose future seemed so full of promise. And it is a pleasure to acknowledge that this community of sympathy was recognised by M. Laffitte on a like occasion, in which we are more nearly concerned. Need I name Mr. Geddes?

The depression due to such losses must not make us doubt the progress of Positivism. Its twenty-five years of existence have not been without fruit. Our business is to avail ourselves of such results as have been attained. The troubled state in which we live admits of no other remedy than the one which has been committed to our charge, from whatever side we approach the consideration of the disorder which prevails. Take, for example, the European concert so much spoken of lately, and which leads to so little, because it lacks the only solid basis, the common faith which could unite and guide.

All other foundations are insufficient and precarious. Diplomacy, a wise policy, are doubtless of value as palliations. Religion alone is a remedy. The religion actually prevailing being put out of the question as inadequate, the real question is how to propagate the new one which is to take its place. The answer is very nigh us. Auguste Comte has given it. We must look to the systematic worship of Humanity. Our great concern, then, should be the installation of that worship. Our attention to this point will be no hindrance to our acting in other directions.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

LOVE FOR PRINCIPLE
AND ORDER FOR BASIS;
PROGRESS FOR END.

LIVE FOR OTHERS.

LIVE OPENLY.

FOURTH ANNUAL CIRCULAR

ADDRESSED TO EVERY SUBSCRIBER TO THE VOLUNTARY
FUND INSTITUTED BY AUGUSTE COMTE ON BEHALF
OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF HUMANITY.

London, 15 Moses 94 (15 January, 1882).

The formation of the Positive Priesthood is become the first condition of a renovation which is as imperatively demanded by order as by progress. Positivists at the outset had to ascend from faith to love, but henceforward they should give the preference to the more rapid and more effective method which leads downward from love to faith.

AUGUSTE COMTE.

SIR,

The accounts of the Sacerdotal Fund for the past year show a decrease in the number of subscribers and in the amount subscribed. The withdrawal of all the French contributors explains this in part, but not altogether. Other subscribers have not paid; whether intentionally, or from forgetfulness, or under the pressure of circumstances, I have no means of determining. And new subscribers have not come in sufficient number to compensate the abstention of the old. Amongst the new ones I notice with satisfaction the addition from India; we have now five Hindu subscriptions. In regard to subscription to our fund, as in all our work, we want steady energy, and that each should remember that with himself lies the responsibility, that he should not leave the initiative to others. I would suggest that it is desirable to have the subscriptions paid earlier in the year, wherever they are recognised as a regular obligation.

The object of this fund is to provide for the maintenance and development of the new Spiritual Power which the Religion of Humanity requires as its organ. At present the fund serves this purpose best by giving as much completeness as is possible to our action in London, and by aiding other centres, wherever they exist, in France, England, or elsewhere, as well as by helping to form new ones.

In my last circular I stated that the greatest charge upon it had been the support of a centre in Paris. And even this last year the expenses connected with the apartment in Paris form a not inconsiderable item in our expenditure. So far as we are concerned, however, the state of things in France has greatly changed. I spoke last year of a certain disagreement between me and my French colleagues as to the method to be adopted, as also of the necessity, recognised on both sides, that we should act independently. The disagreement became more thorough as we went on, and ended in a rather abrupt separation on the part of Dr. Audiffrent, whose lead was followed by the others, accompanied by the assertion of an exclusive claim to, and direction of, the apartment we had jointly taken.

Indeed, no failure could be more complete than has been the attempt to form a centre in Paris in connection with our movement in London, the object being to improve the general Positivist action. That it has left some good results I do not deny. It was a great thing to secure some protest on the part of the French Positivists against the Ferry Law. Besides this protest against the *Decrees*, the Positivist doctrine on the general policy of the Republican party; on the complete separation of the Spiritual and Temporal powers; and on Divorce, was clearly and forcibly enunciated in pamphlets issued by Drs. Audiffrent and Sémérie. I would express my hope that in this mode at least their action will be continued, and that the cause will not cease to have the benefit of their great and undisputed intellectual power. But the main object, as I conceived it, of our combined effort, was early put aside, so that there remain only certain pamphlets as a memorial of it, no steady action having ever been set on foot. The apartment, 30, Rue Jacob, has been given up, I hear. Dr. Audiffrent has returned to Marseilles, announcing his resolution not to return to Paris, abandoning, therefore, all direction or claim to it as the centre of a Parisian group. The movement, I repeat, has failed; its only practical result in England is the severance from us of a small group in connection with Dr. Audiffrent, in which group M. Pradeau is the principal name.

Accepting this failure, with whatever ridicule attaches to it, we have to allow, as a fact, that there exists now no other centre in Paris but that of No. 10, Rue Monsieur-le-Prince, under the direction of M. Laffitte, and the question arises, what is to be our attitude towards it? By *our* I mean the attitude of the composite body which was the main constituent of the Western group originally formed, and which we hoped to keep in conjoint activity till such time as a more intimate union with our co-religionists of other groups should again be possible. In plain terms, can we return to the direction of M. Laffitte, as no other French direction is open?

I withdrew formally in 1878 from that direction, on the general ground that it had not been good in the past, and that it did not promise to be satisfactory in the future. Its fault was mainly one of omission. It did not stamp on the whole Positivist movement, which was bound up with it till that date, with sufficient prominence, the character of a new Religion; it had remained too intellectual, and, as such, too little able to give the impulse that was desired. As inadequate it fettered our energies, and we threw ourselves back on the course recommended by Auguste Comte, the not binding ourselves to one head, but trusting to free effort. I add that the defect above indicated had this further consequence, that it made the movement insufficiently Western, for it is only on the ground of a common religious change that the West, as a whole, can be addressed with any prospect of securing a real union.

G G G

It is necessary to state thus, quite generally, the grounds of the decision taken in 1878 in conjunction with my then French colleagues, and taken because of that conjunction. They have left me. Is the decision to be reversed? We answer with regret: No, as regards the direction; for to reverse it would be inconsistent with the main object we had in view. It has never been our wish to be on other than the most friendly relations with the body of our French co-religionists. We have always attached the greatest importance to the union with France, and to the feelings of Positivist brotherhood. We have given proofs of our wish as a body to maintain a certain degree of union with M. Laffitte, in recognition of our joint past. To all this we still fully adhere. We offer our co-operation in all common interests, we offer support in money to the fund which M. Laffitte directs—a collective support, according to our means. In a word, we will do all in our power to contribute towards the union which should exist between all the disciples of our Faith, and, above all, to the promotion of a good feeling between its French and English representatives; the total suppression of any exclusive nationalism is with us a cardinal doctrine.

But acquiescence in M. Laffitte's direction is really less possible than it was. I will very shortly say why. Since the separation there have been two or three great questions on which he has taken a course which we cannot accept, and they are questions of most real importance. My remarks on them shall be very brief:—

1st. On the Ferry Law he was silent, and yet it was urgently required of any leader of the new Spiritual Power that he should vindicate in France the full liberty that power considers desirable, even for its most powerful and dangerous opponents.

2ndly. On the affair of Tunis he has so spoken as to greatly injure our cause. He has, as we think, given a completely wrong judgment, objectionable both in form and in substance. I need not say much on this point, as we see his direction practically repudiated by his adherents both in England and France. I allude to the manifesto bearing Mr. Beesly's signature in England, and, in regard to France, to a pamphlet by Dr. Robinet and a paper issued by the Positivist Society in Paris, and signed by MM. Magnin and Finance. In all three we substantially and heartily agree. Nor whilst on this point is it to be forgotten that the judgment on Tunis is not the mere acceptance by M. Laffitte of a particular transaction, where it is so easy to go wrong. His whole conception of the relations between France and Northern Africa seems in contradiction with that of Auguste Comte, and with our conception and action on all international relations. I limit myself to the most general statement.

3rdly. On an important point of general direction we cannot concur with him. He says: 'Our task is much more to enlighten men's minds by teaching than to kindle their hearts by preaching.' This is a statement for our guidance which cannot be easily reconciled with the second of the two extracts from Auguste Comte, which I prefix as a motto to this circular, and in the full spirit of which we seek to conduct our propaganda. It cannot in my judgment be reconciled with the general tenor of our Master's later teaching. It cannot be reconciled with former or present experience as to the propagation of a Religion.

In fact, had the nominal union which M. Laffitte urged been accepted, it could hardly have borne the strain since put upon it. Better is it in all ways to express our sympathy with him in such useful work as he is doing or directing, as again with the body over which he presides, to recognise that body as the only Positivist organisation which

to our knowledge exists in France, but not to hamper ourselves with the difficulties which must result from a closer union, when there are such wide differences between us and him who would naturally be the head of such union. Nor do these differences seem likely to disappear. On the contrary, it would seem that the tendency both in France and England is to emphasize them by pressing forward the intellectual to the relative discouragement of the more directly religious movement. Such seems the general direction, not without counterbalancing indications.

We Positivists have often been charged in England with an undue hostility to our country, with a want of patriotism. The charge is not well founded. It is true that we have spoken freely on the shortcomings of our country in the past and in the present, but it has always been with the object of rendering her more worthy of the love and service of her children. We have but acted on the ordinary principle which is universally recognised in morality. We have sought to mend ourselves before mending others, and our introduction of that principle into political questions is the logical consequence of our doctrine that politics are subordinate to morals. But having exposed ourselves singly or in a body to obloquy by our conduct, we may fairly look to our co-religionists in other countries to support us by the adoption of the same method in the general. Again, our constant acceptance of the primacy of France in the European world has been much disliked. We do not hesitate on this point. By virtue of the creation of Auguste Comte, were there no other ground, the initiative must remain with France. But the recognition of her leadership can only be general when, by her whole conduct, she shall have made it clear that she is worthy of such leadership. By all the weight that we allow to her, we are entitled to call upon her to purify her action of all merely national impulses. The manifesto of MM. Magnin and Finance is completely in this spirit ; it is a pleasure to recognise it.

Auguste Comte, we must not forget whilst we are upon this point, wished that Paris should be the present centre of the West, giving the direction to Western policy, but that direction was to be vested, not in a merely Parisian or French, but in a Western body, in which all the leading nationalities of the West primarily, then the other outlying peoples, should be represented. The dangers inherent in any exclusive national direction would thus be obviated. (*See for details, Pol. Pos. I., pp. 309-313.*)

My annual address relieves me from any necessity of details as to our special action in England ; I have spoken in it of the English Positivist movement in general, in its various centres and relations. There is everywhere an increase of activity visible, but still the growth of the Religion of Humanity demands, by its slowness, the utmost patience ; and that, as far as I can judge, everywhere equally—not merely in England. Our discipline in that respect ought by this time to have given us the requisite strength.

For the United States, what I said in my last circular holds good for the present. That the heaven is slowly working there I have no doubt. A letter which I have seen by Mr. Courtland Palmer were alone sufficient to prove this. The want there is the general want at the beginning of a new order of things : some person who can gather others round him and condense the dispersed forces. In India substantial progress has been made. The importance is so great of the few early adherents, that the small body which was to meet on the Festival of Humanity of this year weighs far beyond its numerical value. Four or five convinced adherents

break the spell of isolation, and four or five Hindu adherents were then to meet Mr. Cotton for the celebration of the Festival. It is to be wished for India that there should be complete independence of all passing European influence, that the movement should be a Hindu movement, with a Hindu centre, however friendly its relations with all who share its belief, for only on that condition has it in itself any guarantee of persistence, owing to the constant shifting of European officials. Moreover, an independent body of Hindu disciples would weigh more with opinion outside; by its independence would act with more effect on its own proper environment; and lastly, would be in a better position for examining the peculiar problems which are connected with the transition, necessarily so gradual and demanding such great caution—the transition from their present to the normal state. Such independence need in no way exclude full co-operation and mutual counsel.

What I have said may show that the year has not been uneventful in regard to the internal history of Positivism. And whilst I allow that there is much to regret, the general conclusion is in favour of the inherent vigour of the new Religion. No obstacles prevent its advance, however much they may slacken the speed of that advance—not even that worst obstacle from which we have suffered so cruelly in the short period of our existence as a body, the obstacle of death. This year, as former years, has been one of great losses.

I knew M. Cons but slightly, but I have a very pleasant recollection of him, and know from all I have heard that his loss deprives us of a co-worker whose value was yearly increasing. I would speak with great care of another death, once more, as so often, a sadly premature death, that of Madame Robinet. But I cannot but offer, on my own behalf and for others who knew her, to her family and friends, this public, if simple, expression of our heartfelt sorrow for her loss—a common loss, I add, to the whole Positivist family. An intimacy of twenty years warrants me in saying that she never shrank from personal sacrifice, never wavered in the path of duty or in the service of Humanity.

Such memories over-ride all divergences.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

The Sacerdotal Fund.

	£	s.	d.
Balance from last year 92 (1880)	115	7	6

Subscriptions for the year 93 (1881).

		£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Occidental 67	{ Minimum ...	0	0	2	} ...	276	11	11
	{ Average ...	4	2	6				
	{ Maximum ...	50	0	0				
Oriental 5	{ Minimum ...	0	5	0	} ...	7	5	0
	{ Average ...	1	9	0				
	{ Maximum ...	4	3	4				
Total.....	72				Total ...	£283	16	11

Expenses for the year 93 (1881).

	£	s.	d.
Expenses of No. 30, Rue Jacob (Rent, Service, Furniture) ...	25	0	0
Bust of Auguste Comte for the School, with expenses of re- production, pedestal, &c.	27	14	8
Expenses of Organ	13	17	6
Printing Expenses in connection with the Fund (Prayers Circulars, Advertisements)	9	18	0
Administration, Travelling, &c.	30	0	0
Birmingham.....	6	15	6
	113	5	8
Balance in hand	170	11	3
Total	£283	16	11

	£	s.	d.
Amount for the year 90 (1878)	156	13	0
" " " 91 (1879)	260	0	0
" " " 92 (1880)	335	19	6
" " " 93 (1881)	283	16	11

RELIGION DE L'HUMANITÉ.

RÉPUBLIQUE OCCIDENTALE.

L'AMOUR POUR PRINCIPE
ET L'ORDRE POUR BASE ;
LE PROGRÈS POUR BUT.

VIVRE POUR AUTRUI.

VIVRE AU GRAND JOUR.

QUATRIÈME CIRCULAIRE ANNUELLE

ADRESSÉE À CHAQUE COÖPÉRATEUR DU LIBRE SUB-
SIDE INSTITUÉ PAR AUGUSTE COMTE POUR LE
SACERDOCE DE L'HUMANITÉ.

Londres, le 15 Moise 94 (15 Janvier, 1882).

La formation du sacerdoce positif devient la première condition d'une régénération non moins indispensable à l'ordre qu'au progrès.

Quoique les positivistes aient dû d'abord monter de la foi vers l'amour, ils doivent désormais préférer la marche plus rapide et plus efficace qui descend de l'amour à la foi.

AUGUSTE COMTE.

MONSIEUR,

D'après le compte-rendu de notre situation financière il y a diminution cette année aussi bien dans le nombre des souscripteurs que dans la somme versée. Elle s'explique en partie par l'absence des contributions françaises, mais en partie seulement. D'autres n'ont pas souscrit, que ce soit de propos délibéré, ou par oubli, ou faute de moyens,—je n'ai pas de renseignements à cet égard. Le chiffre des nouveaux souscripteurs n'a pas compensé cette abstention. Je me plais cependant à signaler une augmentation des adhérents Indous. Nous en avons actuellement cinq. La persistance qu'exige toute notre action positiviste doit caractériser notre participation au subsidé ; on ne doit pas oublier que chacun a sa responsabilité, qu'il ne peut pas s'en prendre aux autres. Il est à désirer que ceux qui se reconnaissent le devoir de souscrire ne remettent pas leurs paiements à la fin de l'année.

Le fonds sacerdotal a pour but de maintenir et de développer le nouveau pouvoir spirituel qui doit servir d'organe à la Religion de l'Humanité. Actuellement son meilleur emploi est de perfectionner autant que possible notre action à Londres, d'assister les divers centres quelconques du positivisme, partout où ils existent, en France, en Angleterre, ou ailleurs, et d'aider à la création de nouveaux.

Dans ma dernière circulaire on a pu voir que le principal effort portait sur le maintien d'un centre à Paris; dans la présente on verra que l'effort a continué et que les frais de l'appartement comptent pour quelque chose. Pourtant, en ce qui nous regarde, la situation a beaucoup changé en France. J'ai accusé l'année dernière un certain désaccord entre mes collègues français et moi, quant à la méthode à suivre, et j'ai dit que de part et d'autre on reconnoissait la nécessité d'une indépendance complète. Le désaccord s'est accentué et a amené une rupture assez brusque de la part du Dr. Audiffrent, suivi par les autres membres de ce centre. L'appartement que nous nous étions combinés pour louer devait dépendre en tout de lui.

En effet nous avons échoué aussi complètement qu'il était possible dans notre tentative de former un centre à Paris, se rattachant à notre mouvement à Londres et ayant pour but une amélioration générale de l'action positiviste. Quelques résultats utiles ont été obtenus. Il importait à notre cause qu'une protestation contre la loi Ferry émanât des positivistes français. Il y a eu en outre des publications où l'on a exposé avec clarté et vigueur la politique républicaine; la nécessité d'une complète séparation du temporel et du spirituel; et la doctrine positiviste sur le divorce (*Voir les brochures de MM. Audiffrent et Sémérie*). Je me permets d'exprimer le vœu que sous cette forme au moins leur propagande se continue, et que leur grande valeur intellectuelle, que tous admettent, ne soit pas perdue. Quoiqu'il en soit, le but principal, selon moi, de notre concert a été de bonne heure écarté, aucune action sérieuse et suivie n'a été tentée et il ne reste que certaines publications. L'appartement, 30 Rue Jacob, est abandonné. Le Dr. Audiffrent rentre à Marseille, en annonçant qu'il ne retournera plus à Paris. Il s'ensuit qu'il renonce à toute prétention d'exercer la direction comme centre d'un groupe parisien. Je le répète, le mouvement est une affaire manquée. Pour nous autres en Angleterre son seul résultat effectif est la scission d'un petit groupe qui reconnoît pour chef le Dr. Audiffrent. Le nom le plus marquant dans ce groupe est celui de M. Pradeau.

En admettant cet insuccès avec tout le ridicule qui s'y attache, nous devons reconnaître qu'en fait il n'existe plus à Paris que le centre No. 10 Rue Monsieur-le-Prince, sous la direction de M. Laffitte. Et la question se pose naturellement, quelle est l'attitude que nous prenons vis-à-vis de ce centre. J'entends par nous les positivistes de diverses provenances qui ont constitué la majorité du groupe occidental formé à l'époque de la séparation, groupe dont nous espérons voir se continuer l'activité combinée jusqu'à ce qu'il fût possible de le ramener à une union plus intime avec tous nos co-religionnaires. Franchement, pouvons nous reprendre la direction de M. Laffitte en l'absence de toute autre direction française?

En 1878 j'ai renoncé à cette direction par ce motif général. Elle n'avait pas été bonne dans le passé, elle ne nous offrait pas une perspective satisfaisante dans l'avenir. Elle péchait principalement par défaut. Elle n'imprimait pas assez au mouvement positiviste le caractère religieux, elle était restée trop intellectuelle et par conséquent ne donnait pas l'impulsion voulue. Insuffisante, elle nous entravait. Nous en revînmes donc au conseil d'Auguste Comte, nous cessâmes de nous lier trop intimement, nous nous repliâmes sur les libres efforts des disciples. J'ajoute que par suite du défaut signalé le mouvement général devenait trop peu occidental, une nouvelle religion seule pouvant ramener l'occident à une union solide.

Il fallait exposer succinctement les motifs de la décision que nous

avons prise en 1878, mes collègues français et moi, et que nous avons prise en vertu de notre concert. Ils m'ont quitté. La décision—devons nous faire un retour sur elle? Nous répondons à regret: Non, en tant qu'il s'agit de la direction, car ce serait manquer le but principal que nous nous sommes proposé. Nous avons toujours désiré les relations les plus amicales avec nos co-religionnaires français. Nous avons toujours senti la haute importance de notre union avec la France aussi bien que de la fraternité positiviste. Nous avons prouvé par des actes collectifs que nous désirions maintenir à un certain degré l'union avec M. Laffitte, vu notre passé commun. Nous en sommes toujours au même point de vue. Nous offrons notre concours, notre appui pécuniaire collectif, en souscrivant collectivement selon nos moyens au fonds sacerdotal que dirige M. Laffitte. En un mot, nous ferons notre possible pour développer l'accord qui doit régner entre tous les disciples de la nouvelle foi, et surtout entre ses représentants français et anglais. L'exclusion de tout nationalisme est pour nous un dogme fondamental.

Mais il nous est moins possible qu'il ne l'était d'accepter la direction de M. Laffitte. Et voici pourquoi. Depuis la séparation son action a été pour nous inacceptable relativement à certaines questions du jour, questions d'une importance capitale, que j'indiquerai brièvement.

1° Sur la loi Ferry il s'est tu, et cependant il était urgent qu'il parlât en sa qualité de l'un des chefs du nouveau pouvoir spirituel, et qu'il réclamât pour la France la pleine liberté que revendique ce pouvoir, même pour ses adversaires les plus puissants et les plus dangereux.

2° Sur l'affaire de Tunis M. Laffitte a parlé, mais de manière à faire beaucoup de mal à notre cause. Nous pensons qu'il l'a mal jugée, que son jugement pèche par la forme et par le fond. Il est permis de ne pas insister, car nous avons vu sa direction rejetée par ses adhérents tant en Angleterre qu'en France. Pour la première je fais allusion au jugement signé par M. Beesly; pour la France j'indique la brochure du Dr. Robinet et le manifeste de la Société Positiviste de Paris, signé par MM. Magnin et Finance. A ces trois pièces nous adhérons pleinement. Et on ne doit pas oublier, à propos de l'affaire de Tunis, que M. Laffitte ne se borne pas à l'acceptation d'un fait particulier, où l'erreur est si facile. Sa manière de concevoir l'attitude de la France vis-à-vis de l'Afrique du Nord nous paraît en contradiction avec les vues d'Auguste Comte, aussi bien qu'avec toutes nos conceptions et notre action antérieures à l'égard des relations internationales. Je reste dans les termes les plus généraux.

3° Nous ne saurions être d'accord avec lui sur un point capital qui intéresse la direction générale. Il dit: "Nous avons bien plus à éclairer les esprits par l'enseignement qu'à échauffer les cœurs par la prédication." Un tel langage se concilie difficilement avec le second extrait des écrits d'Auguste Comte que j'ai choisi pour épigraphe, et qui nous guide dans notre propagande. Il se concilie, à mon avis, difficilement avec l'esprit général des derniers enseignements de notre commun maître. Il n'est guère d'accord avec l'expérience du passé ou la notre en ce qui regarde la propagation d'une nouvelle religion.

M. Laffitte a beaucoup insisté pour que je maintinsse une union d'apparence. Elle n'eût pas supporté la tension actuelle. Il vaut mieux à tous égards que tout en sympathisant avec lui dans tout ce qu'il fait, ou qui se fait, d'utile sous sa direction, aussi bien qu'avec le groupe qu'il préside, tout en reconnaissant ce group comme la seule organisation positiviste qui à notre su existe en France, il vaut mieux, dis-je, ne pas nous entraver par une union plus intime. Il y a trop de divergence entre nous et celui qui serait naturellement le chef de cette union. Et

nos divergences ne sont point en voie de disparaître. Au contraire il semble que dans les deux pays on tend à les accentuer en développant le côté intellectuel aux dépens du côté religieux de notre propagande positiviste. Tel nous paraît le sens général du mouvement, en faisant leur juste part à certaines indications contraires.

On a reproché aux positivistes anglais d'être trop hostiles à leur pays, de manquer de patriotisme. Le reproche est peu mérité. A vrai dire nous n'avons pas hésité à reconnaître les torts de notre patrie passés et présents, mais notre but a toujours été d'améliorer l'action de l'Angleterre afin qu'elle fût plus digne de l'amour et du service de ses enfants. Nous avons parlé et agi au nom d'un principe affirmé par tous les moralistes. Avant de prêcher aux autres nous avons cherché à nous perfectionner nous-mêmes. La logique nous oblige à l'introduction de ce principe dans les questions politiques puisque nous subordonnons la politique à la morale. Mais après nous être exposés ainsi, seuls, ou collectivement, nous pouvons faire appel à nos divers co-religionnaires dans les autres pays, et les inviter à nous appuyer en adoptant la même méthode générale.

En outre, on nous en veut d'avoir accepté constamment la présidence de la France en Europe. Quant à cela, nous ne bronchons pas. Par suite de l'œuvre d'Auguste Comte seule, et en dehors de tout autre motif, l'initiative resterait avec la France. Mais on n'admettra généralement cette initiative que quand la France aura montré par toute sa conduite qu'elle en est digne. Nous qui l'admettons actuellement, qui attribuons à la France une si haute fonction nous pouvons bien demander qu'elle se purifie, qu'elle rejette toute impulsion purement nationale. Le manifeste de MM. Magnin et Finance est entièrement dans ce sens, c'est avec plaisir que nous le reconnaissons.

C'est ici que nous devons rappeler qu' Auguste Comte, en faisant de Paris le centre actuel de l'occident d'où émanerait la direction de la politique occidentale constituait en même temps un corps occidental et non pas purement parisien, un comité directeur dans lequel siègeraient des représentants, en premier lieu de toutes les populations occidentales, ensuite des nationalités non-occidentales. Cette institution écartait d'avance les dangers propres à toute direction exclusive (*Voir la Politique Positive, Vol. I., pp. 384, 385.*)

Mon discours du jour de l'an me permet de passer sur les détails de notre action spéciale en Angleterre. J'y ai parlé du mouvement positiviste en Angleterre, de ses divers centres et leurs relations. Partout il y a augmentation d'activité; toutefois le progrès de la Religion de l'Humanité exige par sa lenteur une grande patience. Et il en est partout de même si je ne me trompe. Une longue expérience doit nous donner la force nécessaire pour supporter cette épreuve.

Pour les Etats-Unis la situation reste essentiellement la même; le terrain se prépare sans doute; une lettre publiée par M. Courtlandt Palmer en fait foi. Il y manque, ce qui manque trop souvent au début d'un nouvel ordre, un homme qui puisse rallier et condenser les forces dispersées.

Quant à l'Inde il y a vraiment progrès. Les premiers adhérents ont une importance, au delà de leur nombre, c'est pourquoi la réunion peu nombreuse qui devait avoir lieu à Calcutta le jour de l'an a une grande valeur. Quatre ou cinq croyants convaincus soulèvent le poids de l'isolement, et ce nombre de disciples indous devait célébrer avec M. Cotton notre grande Fête. Il est à désirer que dans l'Inde une action indépendante de toute influence européenne passagère se constitue, un mouvement indou avec un centre indigène, si amicales que soient ses

relations avec tous ses co-religionnaires. C'est là la condition de permanence, vu le changement toujours imminent des employés européens. D'ailleurs un corps indépendant aurait plus de poids pour l'opinion extérieure, réagirait mieux sur son milieu propre, et serait mieux placé pour aborder les problèmes de la transition, le passage à l'état normal, qui demande tant de précautions. L'indépendance dont je parle n'exclut en aucune façon le concours et le conseil.

J'ai assez dit pour montrer que l'année n'a pas été sans fruit. Qu'il y ait quelque chose à regretter, je le veux bien, mais en somme tout fait ressortir la force de vie inhérente à la nouvelle religion. Les obstacles ralentissent sa marche, mais elle avance toujours, malgré tous les obstacles, même le pire de tous, celui de la mort qui nous a si cruellement éprouvés pendant notre courte existence collective. L'année qui vient de s'écouler est marquée par de grandes pertes.

J'ai peu connu M. Cons, mais le peu que j'en ai connu me laisse un bon souvenir, et d'après tout ce que j'ai oui dire à son égard sa mort nous prive d'un collaborateur dont la valeur croissait avec les années. Je parle avec réserve d'une autre mort, une mort comme tant d'autres si tristement prématurée, la mort de Madame Robinet. Mais je ne saurais m'abstenir d'offrir ici publiquement à sa famille et à ses amis, en mon nom et au nom d'autres qui l'ont connue, l'expression simple et sincère de notre profonde douleur. C'est une perte pour toute la famille positiviste. Une amitié de vingt ans m'autorise à dire qu'elle ne s'est jamais refusée à un sacrifice quelconque, qu'elle n'a jamais hésité en présence d'un devoir ou quand il s'agissait de servir l'Humanité.

De tels souvenirs surmontent toute divergence.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

LOVE FOR PRINCIPLE
AND ORDER FOR BASIS;
PROGRESS FOR END.

LIVE FOR OTHERS.

LIVE OPENLY.

FIFTH ANNUAL CIRCULAR

ADDRESSED TO EVERY SUBSCRIBER TO THE VOLUNTARY FUND INSTITUTED BY AUGUSTE COMTE ON BEHALF OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF HUMANITY.

London, 15 Moses 95 (15 January, 1883).

The formation of the Positivist Priesthood is become the first condition of a renovation which is as imperatively demanded by order as by progress. Positivists at the outset had to ascend from faith to love, but henceforward they should give the preference to the more rapid and more effective method which leads downward from love to faith.

AUGUSTE COMTE.

SIR,

The accounts show the state of the Sacerdotal Fund. There have been twelve new subscribers, one oriental subscriber having died. The total subscribed is somewhat less than last year, owing mainly to Dr. Burnell's death. Again there is an increase in the Hindoo contribution. In regard to subscription I venture to repeat the appeal I made last year for earlier payment and without any reminder. It was not responded to as much as I hoped it would be. Keeping always in view the proper object of the fund, the formation of the Priesthood, I apply it at present in the manner indicated in the accounts, to the support, that is, of any centres that have arisen or that may arise, and to meeting our own material or other wants in London. I have transferred the balance of the last year but one to the Printing Fund, in order that some really important publications might not be delayed, such as the translation of Condorcet's Arithmetic by Dr. Kaines, and the Italian translation of the Positive Catechism, as also the English translation of the Eight Circulars of Auguste Comte.

The movement in Liverpool is completely self-sustained, but I thought it advisable, as an evidence of the interest we all feel in regard to it, to offer our co-religionists there a sum to be used at discretion in ornamenting the room or otherwise.

Our contribution places the Birmingham Positivists in possession, without any strain on them, of a well-furnished and convenient room, the rent of which also falls on the central fund. So that they will be freer to meet their other current expenses.

Our help in Newcastle is on a smaller scale, but if Mr. Quin finds a

suitable room we may have to increase it in the course of this year, and other demands may arise for which we should be prepared. I urge therefore on all such well-considered effort as may enable us to meet these demands.

In agreement with Mr. Crompton I have simplified our arrangements by fusing the two funds, there being no reason for their separation considering the use we at present make of the general fund. This concentration should not affect the subscriptions; what was before given in two sums can now be given in one. By the maintenance of the London and other rooms we aim at affording scope for such preparatory action as may promote the formation of the larger body of adherents which can alone form the basis for true priestly action in the future, as furnishing on a sufficient scale younger members to be taught, whilst by its internal wants it demands the exercise of the other priestly functions, counsel, consecration, and judgment. I need hardly add that such a larger body is indispensable as a support for those who might be ready, if there were this encouragement, to devote themselves to the priestly office.

You will see—it is the last point on which I touch in connection with the fund—that in accordance with the engagements of the last Circular, I have offered a definite contribution to the Sacerdotal Fund, which M. Laffitte directs. From the beginning of our differences I have always said that had those differences been entirely between English and French disciples I would have acquiesced in the previously existing order, but that it was another thing when within the French body itself there was much disagreement. If there had been a real danger of the separation coinciding with national distinctions it should have been avoided at any cost. It did not originally so coincide, and it took place. Circumstances have altered, and there is now no support to our movement given by any French disciple. It seems to me, then, that it is our duty to give as complete a recognition of the only French centre which exists as is compatible with a certain measure of independence necessitated by our difference of judgment. I append my letter to M. Laffitte.

Could I have foreseen the conduct of the eminent French Positivists with whom I acted and to whom I felt myself bound, such a position would, I quite acknowledge, have been the wiser one in 1878. As they have thrown me completely over, I am freed from any obligation to them. Whilst united with them our group preserved its Western character, and affirmed the principle to which I have always clung, the principle of close union with France. It is, I think, the general wish that we should still affirm that principle, and without the sacrifice of the object at stake throughout our movement we may make that wish felt.

In regard to such other centres as we collectively help, I have stated, with the concurrence of all whom I could consult, that our aid is given almost unconditionally, with the admission of their several complete independence of action. If not the best course, it is, in my judgment, the only one possible under our English conditions. We must be content with a general union of feeling, confident that such union will lead farther. There will be cooperation for a common end with an independent choice of means.

Such, under existing circumstances, is the relation which we should be in towards the French body under M. Laffitte, with one addition, that we recognise it as a collective duty to contribute in support of his efforts. I cannot but hope that we shall be met in the same spirit as that in which we act, both towards the French Positivists and to other English groups.

These details of our money arrangements show of themselves the extension of our movement. As I have spoken of that movement in all its separate parts at some length in my Annual Address, I may content myself here with the briefest remarks, this Circular being merely supplementary to the address. The year has been one of steady growth, and in many ways of good augury for the future. There is more to encourage our effort, whether we look to our own advance or the tone of general opinion around us. Especially is this the case in France so far as I can gather from incidental notices, whatever reserve prudence may dictate in speaking of Positivist action in that country.

With all the weight of our obligations to Auguste Comte upon us, we can never doubt the initiative of France. She must be the spiritual centre of the West as the birth-place of the Religion of Humanity. We have to wait for the vigorous impulsion which would be given by her frank and logical acceptance of this position through her adhesion to the new faith, such acceptance guaranteeing the abandonment of any erroneous tendency there may be in her present aspirations.

We must feel, apart from any such considerations, that the uncertainty, which hangs over the immediate future of France from the difficulty of her finding competent guidance, renders more than usually imperative every exertion to forward that union between her and England which the peace of the world demands. All recent events conclusively show that an union of any real solidity must depend on the adoption by both countries of a common faith. In commercial and colonial contacts there is far more danger than hope.

Were any justification needed for our persistence in urging on our own country a policy of anti-imperialism, a policy which leads to revision of her past aggressions, and in many cases renunciation of unjust acquisitions, as also to renunciation of all similar efforts in the future, such justification might be found in the natural consequences of the example set at present by England. True she was not the first to set that example. Portugal first, then Spain, then Holland, preceded her in the path which she has so successfully trodden. Much too has been the outcome of the long rivalry between France and England for external empire, which was an incident of the commercial era that succeeded the wars of religion. But in the present we unquestionably are foremost in exercising an oppressive influence on the less advanced populations, and the general opinion of Europe attributes to our success in this respect our great national prosperity; such is the judgment on our state of other nations. The judgment is I must think erroneous, and the dicta of more than one amongst our statesmen warrant me in so thinking. The prosperity is also in itself unsound, bought at the price of our best internal and moral interests. Still it is the judgment formed, and incalculable weight would attach to the practical refutation of it which would be given by the introduction into our policy of a new principle. Just as we seemed nearer this introduction comes this unfortunate and immoral Egyptian expedition to put all back, straining all our relations with France, and adjourning the desired union.

Our national policy precludes any useful criticism by Englishmen on the action of other nations. We must first set our own house in order. But as Positivists we are warranted in speaking freely on any Western question, and accordant utterances in our several countries must aid in effecting a change in opinion where alone such change can be immediately effected, viz., in this Western Europe. The right direction of its great power as regards the other families of mankind is the most

important political question within our ken. It lends to all the internal complications of the European State-System their most powerful interest. As at present, the whole of the rest of the world, wherever it is open from its inferior strength, is looked on as legitimate prey for one European ambition or another. Such at any rate is the superficial current of opinion. It should be our object to evoke or to create a feeling capable of changing it, and of guiding to new, more merciful, and more beneficial uses the misdirected energy which it represents.

This change of opinion can be really effected solely by the substitution of Humanity for God, the root-idea of the Positive Religion—the substitution, that is, of an essentially peaceful power for one which, to say the least, is and has been compatible with the constant existence of war. As things are, each nation claims the common God of all as its peculiar patron. All such exclusive pretensions, whether on the part of one nation, or of an aggregate of nations, fall at once before the claim of Humanity. She includes all nations. She cannot be drawn *in partes*, to take the side, that is, of any of her constituents. She embraces and protects all, and imposes on all equally the duty of labouring in the common cause, and this by virtue of the very significance of her name. With us who believe in her it rests to proclaim her.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

[Translation.]

Letter to Monsieur Pierre Laffitte,
126. Rue d'Assas, Paris.

Sir,

I write to offer you, on the part of the group which I represent, a collective subscription of £50 to your Sacerdotal Fund. This group consists of about eighty-five subscribers—English, Scotch, American, and Hindoo. As no French subscriber belongs to it, the reason for your last refusal no longer exists, and I hope that you will accept the offer which I now repeat under the new conditions which result from the disappearance of all French support.

I am led to take this step by the wish to make it clear that such difference as exists, and it is a grave one, as to the seasonableness of a particular mode of presenting the Religion of Humanity, in no way impairs our feeling of fraternity, nor our sense of the high value attaching to union with France. If I construe aright the general opinion of my colleagues, we wish, whilst maintaining, because of the said disagreement, a certain independence, to manifest our co-operation with the only existing French centre by supporting its head, so closing every opening there might be for a spirit of nationalism.

Outside of the Positivist body, the opinion of those who follow our movement with interest, agreeing with the opinion of the adherents of the new faith, more especially with those who are coming to it, would welcome the termination, so far as possible, of any marked division, while accepting a large measure of freedom in the action of the different centres as regards one another.

My act has a public character, and carries out what I said in the last Circular. As it has this character, I purposely keep it clear of every personal consideration.

Be good enough to accept, Sir, the assurance of my high consideration.

15 Moses 95.
(15 January, 1883.)

RICHARD CONGREVE.

The Sacerdotal Fund.

	£	s.	d.
Balance from 93 (1881)	170	11	3

Subscriptions for the year 94 (1882).

		£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Occidental 76	{ Minimum	0	0	6	}	256	7	8
	{ Average	3	7	5½				
	{ Maximum	50	0	0				
Oriental ... 7	{ Minimum	0	16	8	}	8	11	8
	{ Average	1	4	6				
	{ Maximum	4	3	4				
Total	83					Total.....	£264	19 4

Expenses for the year.

	£	s.	d.
The London Room, Ventilation and Lighting	23	13	4
Organ, repairs and expenses	50	14	0
Printing expenses in connection with the Fund.....	6	6	6
	80	13	10
Liverpool	25	0	0
Birmingham	30	0	0
Newcastle	10	0	0
Administration, Travelling, &c.....	30	0	0
	175	13	10
Balance in hand.....	89	5	6
Total	£264	19	4

	£	s.	d.
Amount for the year 90 (1878)	156	13	0
" " " 91 (1879)	260	0	0
" " " 92 (1880)	335	19	6
" " " 93 (1881)	283	16	11
" " " 94 (1882)	264	19	4

RELIGION DE L'HUMANITÉ.

RÉPUBLIQUE OCCIDENTALE.

L'AMOUR POUR PRINCIPE
ET L'ORDRE POUR BASE ;
LE PROGRÈS POUR BUT.

VIVRE POUR AUTRUI.

VIVRE AU GRAND JOUR.

CINQUIÈME CIRCULAIRE ANNUELLE

ADRESSÉE À CHAQUE COÖPÉRATEUR DU LIBRE SUBSIDE
INSTITUÉ PAR AUGUSTE COMTE POUR LE SACERDOCE
DE L'HUMANITÉ.

Londres, le 15 Moïse 95 (15 Janvier, 1883).

La formation du sacerdoce positif devient la première condition d'une régénération non moins indispensable à l'ordre qu'au progrès.

Quoique les positivistes aient dû d'abord monter de la foi vers l'amour, ils doivent désormais préférer la marche plus rapide et plus efficace qui descend de l'amour à la foi.

AUGUSTE COMTE.

MONSIEUR,

J'expose dans mon compte rendu l'état du subsidé sacerdotal ; nous avons douze nouvelles souscriptions, une orientale nous manquant par la mort. La somme versée est un peu moindre que l'an dernier, ce qui est dû à la mort du Dr. Burnell. Il y a augmentation pour les contributions hindoues. . . . Ne perdant jamais de vue le but essentiel de cette institution, la formation du sacerdoce, l'argent dont je dispose s'emploie actuellement au maintien des centres quelconques, présents ou futurs, et à la satisfaction de nos divers besoins, matériels ou autres, à Londres. Le reste de l'an 93 j'ai versé au fonds typographique afin de faciliter certaines publications importantes, telles que la traduction de l'arithmétique de Condorcet par le Dr. Kaines, la traduction italienne du catéchisme positiviste, et enfin la traduction anglaise des huit circulaires d'Auguste Comte.

Le centre de Liverpool ne demande aucun appui extérieur ; cependant comme preuve de sympathie j'ai cru devoir offrir une certaine somme à nos co-religionnaires dont l'application est à leur discrétion.

Nous avons mis à la disposition des Positivistes de Birmingham, une salle bien située et convenablement meublée, en nous chargeant du loyer. Ils suffiront avec cette aide aux frais ordinaires.

A Newcastle jusqu'ici notre effort est moindre. S'il y a lieu à un accroissement, ce qui dépend de M. Quin, qui cherche toujours à y mieux installer le positivisme, nous serons prêts, aussi bien qu'ailleurs si d'autres occasions se présentent. Je recommande donc à tous une prudente persévérance afin de faire face aux exigences de la situation.

D'accord avec M. Crompton j'ai simplifié nos affaires en ne laissant subsister que le fonds sacerdotal et le fonds typographique. En appliquant le premier au maintien des diverses salles, soit à Londres, soit ailleurs, nous avons pour but de développer notre action préparatoire qui vise à la formation d'un corps plus nombreux d'adhérents—seule base possible du sacerdoce de l'avenir—comme fournissant en nombre suffisant de jeunes élèves. Un tel corps d'après ses propres besoins donne lieu à l'exercice des fonctions sacerdotales de conseil, de consécration, de jugement, et en outre il est nécessaire pour soutenir ceux qui désireraient se dévouer à l'office correspondant.

On verra que, afin de donner suite à ce que j'ai dit dans ma dernière circulaire, j'ai offert une contribution au subsidé sacerdotal de M. Laffitte. Dès le commencement de notre divergence j'ai toujours dit que, se fût-il agi d'un dissentiment entre les disciples français d'un côté et les anglais de l'autre, le statuquo eût dû être maintenu. Mais les positivistes français n'étant pas unis, la situation est autre. On devait éviter à tout prix une séparation qui eût revêtu un caractère de nationalisme. Elle eut lieu parceque ce danger paraissait écarté. Cet état de choses n'existe plus ; aucun appui de notre mouvement ne vient de la France. Il est donc, ce me semble, de notre devoir de reconnaître le seul centre français qui existe autant que le comporte une certaine indépendance nécessitée par notre dissentiment. Je joins à cette circulaire ma lettre à M. Laffitte.

Si j'avais pu prévoir l'action de mes éminents collègues français auxquels je me sentais lié, il eût été plus sage, je l'avoue, de nous en tenir là dès le commencement en 1878. Leur abandon complet me dégage de toute obligation envers eux. Uni avec eux, notre groupe restait occidental et affirmait le principe d'une étroite union avec la France. Eux disparaissant, je crois ne pas me tromper en disant que c'est le vœu général que nous continuions à affirmer ce principe, sans sacrifier notre but principal.

En aidant collectivement d'autres centres, nous ne comptons, d'après l'avis de tous ceux que j'ai pu consulter, imposer aucune condition, à peu près du moins. Nous acceptons leur complète indépendance. Telle est à mon gré la seule, si non la meilleure ligne à suivre, vu nos conditions. Nous devons nous contenter d'abord de l'union des sentiments, elle nous mènera, n'en doutons pas, plus loin. Il y aura concours à un but commun avec indépendance quant aux moyens choisis. Actuellement, telles doivent être nos relations avec le positivisme français dirigé par M. Laffitte. Ajoutons la reconnaissance du devoir collectif d'appuyer ses efforts. J'espère bien que l'on accueillera notre démarche. Elle s'inspire des motifs qui nous guident vis-à-vis de tous nos co-religionnaires anglais.

L'extension de l'action positiviste ressort des indications précédentes. Je n'insiste pas sur les détails que j'ai traités dans mon discours du jour de l'an. En somme il y a eu accroissement pendant l'année qui vient de finir, ce qui est de bon augure pour l'avenir ; que nous envisagions, ou notre progrès propre, ou l'opinion générale, il y a de quoi nous encourager, surtout en France autant que j'en peux juger, quelle que soit d'ailleurs la réserve que la prudence m'impose en parlant de l'action positiviste française.

HHH

Nos obligations envers Auguste Comte pèsent trop sur nous pour que nous puissions révoquer en doute l'initiative de la France. Elle est nécessairement le centre spirituel de l'Occident comme lieu de naissance de la religion de l'Humanité. Nous devons attendre la forte impulsion qui viendrait de la France si elle acceptait franchement cette position en adhérant à la nouvelle foi. Cette adhésion garantirait sa renonciation à toute aspiration ayant une tendance vicieuse.

Quoiqu'il en soit, l'incertitude qui plane sur l'avenir immédiat de la France, d'après l'absence de guides d'une compétence reconnue, doit nous faire sentir spécialement combien il est de notre devoir de faire tout ce qui dépend de nous pour augmenter l'union des deux pays, union si nécessaire à la paix générale. Or les événements récents démontrent que rien de solide ne peut être constitué qu'à la condition que les deux pays adoptent des croyances communes. Les contacts qu'amène le commerce ou l'expansion coloniale inspirent plutôt la crainte que l'espoir.

Nous persistons toujours à recommander à l'Angleterre une politique anti-impérialiste, une politique de revision envers son passé, de renonciation aux conquêtes injustes et à toute tendance semblable à l'avenir. S'il fallait nous justifier, nous n'aurions qu'à invoquer les mauvais effets de son exemple. Il est vrai que l'Angleterre a été précédée dans la voie agressive par le Portugal d'abord, l'Espagne et la Hollande ensuite. Il est vrai aussi que son empire colonial a été le résultat en grande partie de sa longue rivalité avec la France, qui a été un incident de la période commerciale après la terminaison des guerres de religion.

Mais actuellement c'est nous surtout qui opprimons les populations arriérées et c'est là précisément dans l'opinion de l'Europe le secret de la grande prospérité qu'elle nous accorde. C'est une erreur à mon avis, et je pourrais citer à l'appui plus d'un d'entre nos hommes d'état. Aussi bien cette prospérité elle-même est factice, achetée d'ailleurs au détriment de nos véritables intérêts sociaux et moraux. Pourtant telle est l'opinion générale, et il serait hautement utile que l'Angleterre en manifestât pratiquement la futilité en adoptant une nouvelle politique. Malheureusement au moment même où elle paraissait s'en approcher, cette immorale campagne égyptienne vient nous faire rétrograder en aggravant nos relations avec la France et ajournant l'union si désirée.

La politique anglaise ne nous permet pas en tant qu'anglais de critiquer autrui. Il faut commencer par nous-mêmes. Mais notre doctrine nous autorise à nous exprimer librement sur les questions occidentales. Par de libres expositions, pourvu qu'elles s'accordent, les positivistes des divers pays peuvent aider beaucoup à changer l'opinion dominante là où seul le changement puisse avoir une utilité immédiate, c'est à dire dans l'Europe occidentale. Bien diriger son immense supériorité relative vis-à-vis des autres nations, voilà la question politique la plus urgente et la plus importante que nous ayons à considérer. C'est elle qui rend si intéressantes les diverses complications intérieures de l'Europe. Car actuellement tout le reste du monde n'est envisagé, en tant qu'il est faible, que comme la proie légitime de l'ambition d'un état européen quelconque. C'est du moins le sentiment qui domine. Nous devons nous proposer pour but d'évoquer ou de créer une opinion contraire qui puisse utiliser dans un sens plus humain et plus bienfaisant une énergie qui se fourvoie.

Il n'y a d'autre moyen à notre disposition que de substituer l'Humanité à Dieu,—l'idée-mère de la Religion positive. Nous substituons ainsi une puissance essentiellement pacifique à une puissance qui au moins coexiste et a toujours coexisté avec la guerre.

Chaque peuple se croit actuellement sous le patronage spécial du commun dieu. Toute prétention exclusive de la part d'une nation, ou d'un ensemble de nations, tombe naturellement en présence de l'Humanité. Elle les comprend toutes. Elle ne saurait prendre part avec l'une, quelle qu'elle soit, en particulier. En les protégeant toutes elle leur impose à toutes également le devoir de concourir à la cause commune, et cela d'après sa désignation même. A nous de la proclamer.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

84, *Palace Gardens Terrace,*
London, W.

A Monsieur Pierre Laffitte,
126, *Rue d'Assas, Paris.*

Monsieur,

Je viens vous offrir de la part du groupe que je représente une souscription collective à votre subside sacerdotal de 1250 francs. Ce groupe se compose d'environ 85 souscripteurs, anglais, écossais, américains, et hindous. Aucun français n'y participant le motif de votre dernier refus n'existe plus et j'espère que vous agréerez l'offre que je renouvelle sous les conditions nouvelles qui nous sont faites par la disparition de tout appui en France.

Cette démarche est motivée par le désir de démontrer que le dissentiment qui existe, et qui a toujours sa gravité, quant à l'opportunité d'une certaine manière de présenter la religion de l'Humanité, n'altère point nos sentiments de fraternité et notre appréciation de la haute valeur de l'union avec la France. Si j'interprète bien l'opinion générale de mes confrères, nous tenons, tout en maintenant une certaine indépendance, vu ce dissentiment, à assurer notre concours à l'action du seul centre français en appuyant son chef, afin de fermer toute ouverture à l'esprit de nationalisme.

En dehors du corps positiviste l'opinion de ceux qui suivent avec intérêt la marche du Positivisme, en accord avec l'opinion des adhérents de la nouvelle foi, surtout de ceux qui arrivent, voudrait bien voir disparaître, dans les limites du possible, toute division prononcée, en acceptant une grande liberté d'action de la part des divers centres, vis-à-vis l'un de l'autre.

C'est un acte public que j'accomplis, un acte qui donne suite à ce que j'ai dit dans ma dernière circulaire. Parce qu'il a ce caractère j'en écarte à dessein toute considération personnelle.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur, l'assurance de ma haute considération.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

le 15 Moïse 95.
le 15 Janvier 1883.

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

LOVE FOR PRINCIPLE
AND ORDER FOR BASIS;
PROGRESS FOR END.

LIVE FOR OTHERS.

LIVE OPENLY.

SIXTH ANNUAL CIRCULAR

ADDRESSED TO EVERY SUBSCRIBER TO THE VOLUNTARY
FUND INSTITUTED BY AUGUSTE COMTE ON BEHALF
OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF HUMANITY.

London, 15 Moses 96 (15 January, 1884).

The formation of the Positivist Priesthood is become the first condition of a renovation which is as imperatively demanded by order as by progress. Positivists at the outset had to ascend from faith to love, but henceforward they should give the preference to the more rapid and more effective method which leads downward from love to faith.

AUGUSTE COMTE.

SIR,

Our financial statement is given as usual at the end of the circular. It must be remembered that under our present arrangement the accounts give the whole of our income and outgoings, except in so far as the Printing Fund is concerned. That arrangement was explained last year, and accounts for the apparent increase both in receipts and expenditure. In relation to the London room the expense has been unusually heavy, in consequence of its thorough repair and the addition of an organ screen. There is also a considerable increase in wages, owing to our keeping the library open every afternoon from 2 to 6 for the sale of our publications and for greater facility of borrowing the books. So that, with renewed or new payments to other centres, there is with the increase of receipts a slight deficit. The balances from past years enable us to meet this, as also to meet the extra demand occasioned by the reprinting of the Catechism, which has been paid for out of the General Fund, an application of the fund which will be sanctioned, I feel sure, by all contributors.

If some few of our subscribers have failed, the whole number will be seen to be considerably larger. I would urge on all regularity and persistence in the discharge of this simple obligation, when once freely accepted. I again ask for the payments to be made earlier. The annual expenses ought to be met by the annual income, and all

will see the convenience of having the money ready. Besides, when the payments are made very late, it is difficult to calculate what we are justified in undertaking. As to the amount of subscription I have no wish to press anyone. The fund is an important institution. It should be sufficient not only for our present demands, but for the contingency of other demands from fresh centres. It is even now desirable that it were large enough to give help, a help which might be counted on, to any who are preparing for the priesthood or engaged in the work of propagation. Lastly, we ought to keep before us the having a building of our own. Valid reasons then abound why, to the measure of our ability, we should give freely to the cause to which we have pledged ourselves.

The increase in the number of subscribers is encouraging. Those to whom the religious preaching of the Religion of Humanity is the object are as yet so few and so isolated that they should give one another all the support in their power, and each one can add to the support derived from a gradual augmentation of numbers. I submit this consideration in the most general terms to all adherents of the new faith. They may not hitherto have given it due weight.

On the Positivist movement in direct connection with our group I have spoken in the appendix to my Annual Address, now published. For those who may not see that Address I may say very briefly that the record is, on the whole, favourable, that in some places there has been steady continuousness of action, as in America and Calcutta; in others growth, as in Liverpool, Birmingham, Newcastle, and Leicester. In London we still remain numerically weak, with no immediate prospect of advance. The attitude we maintain is the principal cause of our weakness. That weakness might be, it soon would be, considerably diminished were there more determination in those who in the main approve of that attitude. We must work on and wait in patience for the time when the sense of duty to the cause shall make this determination more general than it has hitherto been.

I reprint below my letter of last year to M. Laffitte, and his answer accepting the offer made him. It did not reach me in time for the last circular. My offer was a renewal of previous offers to the same effect; one accepted, one rejected. From the first we have pursued one line of conduct in this respect. We have recognised and been faithful to the obligations imposed on us by our past to co-operate with our French brethren in the material support of M. Laffitte. My circulars bear me out in this. No new step was taken last year. No formal adhesion was given, as is clear from the letter. The acknowledgment of the fact that there is no other French centre is no adhesion to that centre's direction. Nor was it, as has been erroneously stated, a re-opening of communication. There has throughout been, when occasion demanded it, communication, either personally or by letter, between me and M. Laffitte. I can understand why it is sought to put a certain colour on my act of last year, but there is no ground for the proceeding. The allegation that the act was a new departure is unfounded.

In regard to formal adhesion to the Paris centre we stand then where we stood. The original disagreement remains as to the method there adopted. Consequently we must maintain a certain independence, whilst anxious now, as from the first, to keep unimpaired the sense of Positivist fraternity, and to uphold that union with France which, more than anyone else, I have upheld.

Moreover, the Paris centre is divided against itself. This enhances the difficulty. To which side could we adhere? The divergence mani-

fested some time ago in regard to Tunis is repeated in relation to the actual colonial policy of the French Government.

There was a noble protest of the French Positivists in the former case; there has been a noble expression of opinion by Dr. Robinet in the latter. I cannot hear of any other protest addressed to the French Government besides his article, since printed separately as a pamphlet. But in neither case has the director of the Paris centre been a consenting party. Dr. Robinet makes no secret of the fact that his views are not acceptable to M. Laffitte. We are in fullest agreement with Dr. Robinet; but what becomes of the central direction?

Recent utterances have forced on me some such explicit statement of our position.

Divergence on a very capital point of practical policy is a strain upon union, but it need not necessarily lead to separation any more than it need necessitate the continuance of a separation which has taken place. The two leading groups of Auguste Comte's disciples might lay aside every appearance of disunion were the direction in Paris consistently to give a religious character to their movement; were it set forth to the world as primarily and pre-eminently a religion, with the usual objects of a religion, and in such a form as to make it recognised as a religion by the religious communities in the midst of which it rises. This is the real issue. There has, so far as I am aware, been no change at the centre in this respect. If I may judge by the language of M. Laffitte's English adherents there is no present probability of any such change. Rather they seem resolved to accentuate the divergence. Were it to cease, I can safely say there would be little hesitation on our part. Till it cease, our aim must be, whilst securing as much friendship as possible, without any concession in principle, to proceed with all vigour in the course we have hitherto adopted.

One word in conclusion. The first task which devolves on the new spiritual power emanating from the Religion of Humanity is to give peace and union to the West. On no other condition can this intermediate unity—intermediate between the several states and Humanity—exercise aright its leadership; and as it is unfulfilled, an abusive interference is all that is visible—an interference of this or that state in the name of its own interest. Such is our intervention in Egypt. Such, by recent events, is shown more plainly than ever to be our intervention in India. The past year has dispelled all the pleasant official illusions in regard to that country. The language of the Anglo-Indian community, both at home and in India, scatters to the winds all idea of amalgamation as between the European intruder and the native population, and, consequently, all hope of a permanent beneficial union.

Nor if we look to France is there any better prospect. No immediate deviations can change the judgment founded on the whole of past history, the judgment which assigns France the primacy. But in the present we may regret and profoundly disapprove her action, as fraught with danger to herself, as incompatible with any true European order, as untrue to her own best tradition. In all this we are in agreement with the language of Dr. Robinet's truly civic and noble pamphlet. In proportion as throughout we have stood forward in support of the French initiative are we bound, with all respect, to express firmly our dissent when it is a practical misdirection.

If France fails us in the immediate present, we only feel the more deeply how essential she is to any true Western action. Without her the whole political and religious movement is maimed, all the desired reorganisation halts. For the impulse that should spread from the

centre outwards is wanting; and if the other portions of the West can help to remedy, they cannot supply the want; so much must be fully allowed. All they can do is not to slacken their energy whilst waiting for a better direction.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

55 *Palace Gardens Terrace,*
London, W.

[*Translation*].

Letter to Monsieur Pierre Laffitte,

126, *Rue d'Assas, Paris.*

Sir,

I write to offer you, on the part of the group which I represent, a collective subscription of £50 to your Sacerdotal Fund. This group consists of about eighty-five subscribers—English, Scotch, American, and Hindoo. As no French subscriber belongs to it, the reason for your last refusal no longer exists, and I hope that you will accept the offer which I now repeat under the new conditions which result from the disappearance of all French support.

I am led to take this step by the wish to make it clear that such difference as exists, and it is a grave one, as to the seasonableness of a particular mode of presenting the Religion of Humanity, in no way impairs our feeling of fraternity, nor our sense of the high value attaching to union with France. If I construe aright the general opinion of my colleagues, we wish, whilst maintaining, because of the said disagreement, a certain independence, to manifest our co-operation with the only existing French centre by supporting its head, so closing every opening there might be for a spirit of nationalism.

Outside of the Positivist body, the opinion of those who follow our movement with interest, agreeing with the opinion of the adherents of the new faith, more especially with those who are coming to it, would welcome the termination, so far as possible, of any marked division, while accepting a large measure of freedom in the action of the different centres as regards one another.

My act has a public character, and carries out what I said in the last Circular. As it has this character, I purposely keep it clear of every personal consideration.

Be good enough to accept, Sir, the assurance of my high consideration.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

15 *Moses 95.*
(15 *January, 1883.*)
(*Sent the 23rd January.*)

[*Translation.*]

M. Laffitte's Answer.

Paris, 2nd March, 1883 (reached me the 6th).
(5 *Aristotle 95.*)

SIR,

In your letter of the 20th *Moses 95* (*should be the 23rd, 23rd January, 1883*), in the name of the group which you represent you offer the Central Positivist Fund a subscription of 1,250 francs.

I have the honour to inform you that I accept your proposal.

Always greatly impressed with the need of unity, I can but approve, and I am glad of everything which can lessen the separation which exists between Positivists, as also of everything which tends to reduce it to its minimum.

The extreme absorption due to my lectures in the *Salle Gerson*, my various conferences and my other occupations has alone hindered my replying sooner to the proposal you have been good enough to make me.

Be good enough to accept, I beg, Sir, the expression of my highest consideration.

P. LAFFITTE.

126, Rue d'Assas.

(I.)—*The Sacerdotal Fund.*

Balance left from previous years, as per statement below (V).

(II.)—*Subscriptions for the year 95 (1883).*

		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Occidental 121	{ Minimum	0	0	6	3	12	19
	{ Average	2	11	8½			
	{ Maximum	50	0	0			
Oriental... 6	{ Minimum	0	8	4	7	13	4
	{ Average	1	5	6½			
	{ Maximum	4	3	4			
Total ... 127		Total			£320	12	6

(III.)—*Expenses for the year 95 (1883).*

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
London Room :—				186	13	6
Rent	55	0	0			
Gas and Firing	4	0	9			
Wages	42	11	0			
Repairs and Furniture	52	17	8			
Various Items	4	13	8½			
Social Meetings	1	0	10½			
Organ Expenses	15	11	0			
Printing, &c., in connection with room	10	18	6			
Paris Subscription	50	0	0	144	14	7
Birmingham	27	4	7			
Newcastle	37	10	0			
Administration, travelling, &c.....	30	0	0			
Total expenses.....				331	8	1
Deficit on the Year	10	15	7			

				£	s.	d.
(IV.)—Amount for the year 90 (1878)				156	13	0
" " " 91 (1879)				260	0	0
" " " 92 (1880)				325	19	6
" " " 93 (1881)				283	16	11
" " " 94 (1882)				264	19	4
" " " 95 (1883)				320	12	6

				£	s.	d.
(V.)—Balance for the year 92 (1880)				115	7	6
" " " 93 (1881)				170	11	3
" " " 94 (1882)				89	5	6
				375	4	3
Deficit for the year 95 (1883)				10	15	7
				364	8	8
Total Balance				78	2	0
From this deduct the cost of 2nd Edition of 'Catechism'..				£286	6	8

À Monsieur Pierre Laffitte,
126, Rue d'Assas, Paris.

MONSIEUR,

Je viens vous offrir de la part du groupe que je représente une souscription collective à votre subside sacerdotal de 1250 francs. Ce groupe se compose d'environ 85 souscripteurs, anglais, écossais, américains, et hindous. Aucun français n'y participant le motif de votre dernier refus n'existe plus et j'espère que vous agréerez l'offre que je renouvelle sous les conditions nouvelles qui nous sont faites par la disparition de tout appui en France.

Cette démarche est motivée par le désir de démontrer que le dissentiment qui existe, et qui a toujours sa gravité, quant à l'opportunité d'une certaine manière de présenter la religion de l'Humanité, n'altère point nos sentiments de fraternité et notre appréciation de la haute valeur de l'union avec la France. Si j'interprète bien l'opinion générale de mes confrères, nous tenons, tout en maintenant une certaine indépendance, vu ce dissentiment, à assurer notre concours à l'action du seul centre français en appuyant son chef, afin de fermer toute ouverture à l'esprit de nationalisme.

En dehors du corps positiviste l'opinion de ceux qui suivent avec intérêt la marche du Positivisme en accord avec l'opinion des adhérents de la nouvelle foi, surtout de ceux qui arrivent, voudrait bien voir disparaître, dans les limites du possible, tout division prononcée, en acceptant une grande liberté d'action de la part des divers centres, vis-a-vis l'un de l'autre.

C'est un acte public que j'accomplis, un acte qui donne suite à ce que j'ai dit dans ma dernière circulaire. Parce qu'il a ce caractère j'en écarte à dessein toute considération personnelle.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur, l'assurance de ma haute considération.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

le 15 Moise 95.
le 15 Janvier 1883.

A Monsieur R. Congreve, à Londres.
Paris 2 Mars 1883 (5 Aristote 95).

MONSIEUR,

Dans votre lettre du 20 Moïse 95 (20 Janvier 1883) au nom du groupe que vous représentez vous offrez au subsidé central positiviste une souscription de 1250 francs.

J'ai l'honneur de vous annoncer que j'accepte votre proposition.

Toujours fortement préoccupé du besoin de l'unité, je ne puis qu'approuver, et je suis heureux de tout qui peut diminuer l'écart qui existe entre les Positivistes ainsi que de tout ce qui tend à le réduire à son minimum.

L'excessive absorption qui résulte de mon cours salle Gerson, de mes diverses conférences, et de mes autres occupations, m'a seule empêché de répondre plutôt à l'ouverture que vous avez bien voulu me faire.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur, je vous prie, l'expression de ma plus haute considération.

P. LAFFITTE.

126, Rue d'Assas.

Je réimprime ma lettre de l'an dernier à M. Laffitte, et j'y joins sa réponse. Elle m'a été remise trop tard pour ma circulaire. Je me permets quelques observations à ce sujet, afin de bien éclaircir la situation.

L'offre qui a été faite et acceptée n'impliquait nullement une adhésion formelle au centre parisien, ce qui ressort de la lettre même qui la contient. Toujours nous avons reconnu l'obligation de concourir au maintien de M. Laffitte; comme le prouvent mes circulaires. Toujours aussi nous avons désiré maintenir intacte la fraternité positiviste et l'union avec la France. Mais il reste une certaine divergence qui nous oblige de maintenir aussi notre indépendance vis-à-vis de la direction parisienne. Si celle-ci prenait une allure franchement religieuse on hésiterait peu à s'y rallier. Mais jusque-là il importe de conserver notre pleine liberté d'action. Malheureusement, c'est la tendance contraire qui domine, autant qu'on en puisse juger par l'action des adhérents anglais de M. Laffitte.

Du reste, le centre parisien lui-même est divisé, ce qui ne suffirait pas pour motiver une séparation, mais n'en facilite pas non plus la cessation. Inutile de dire que nous adhérons pleinement aux vues de M. le Dr. Robinet.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

LOVE FOR PRINCIPLE
AND ORDER FOR BASIS;
PROGRESS FOR END.

LIVE FOR OTHERS.

LIVE OPENLY.

SEVENTH ANNUAL CIRCULAR

ADDRESSED TO EVERY SUBSCRIBER TO THE VOLUNTARY
FUND INSTITUTED BY AUGUSTE COMTE ON BEHALF
OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF HUMANITY.

London, 15 Moses 97 (15 January, 1885).

The formation of the Positive Priesthood is become the first condition of a renovation which is as imperatively demanded by order as by progress. Positivists at the outset had to ascend from faith to love, but henceforward they should give the preference to the more rapid and more effective method which leads downward from love to faith.

AUGUSTE COMTE.

SIR,

Referring you for the details of our receipts and expenditure to the statement at the end of this circular, there are some points to which I would call your attention.

The result of the year is as nearly as possible an exact balance, after meeting the slight deficit of last year. It is desirable that the fund should increase both in amount and in the number of its contributors that we may extend our action and calculate on it with certainty. Regular payment of what is freely given is also a great object, as it does away with any necessity for a reminder. The punctual discharge of obligations voluntarily accepted should be characteristic of Positivists, and I repeat my request that payments be made earlier in the year. Where it is indifferent to the contributor I should like them in the first half-year. Where this is difficult I would ask for them before the month of December. My reasons I gave in the last circular.

The fund has met as before the expenses of our church in London, the rent of the rooms at Birmingham and Newcastle, with a small contribution, as an evidence of interest, to the one at Leicester. Two other applications of it remain for notice.

1. I sent M. Lemos a sum to help him to publish his annual report

NOTE.—This circular has been delayed longer than I wished chiefly by over-pressure from other work. But though delayed it deals entirely with the past year 96 (1884), avoiding carefully the fresh matter supplied by the current year.

for 1882, delayed from want of funds. It is a great object to secure the publicity of all our Positivist action, and therefore I thought it well to give this assistance which will enable us all to follow more closely the Brazilian movement.

2. There is you will see a sum of £20 given to Mr. Quin, which I hope to double for the year 97 (1885). Those who know his life and effort, and the courage with which he and Mrs. Quin face a really difficult position, as well as the sacrifice he has made to secure his freedom for Positivist work, will see the fitness of the support thus offered him from the English sacerdotal fund. I wish this support could be greater, but with our present resources it is necessary to be cautious. Anyone who considers this its first personal application will see what reason there is to wish the fund both larger and more sure as resting on a wider basis.

There remains the question of the subscription to M. Laffitte's fund. The events of last year essentially change the situation as regards this subscription. I have always, since my rejection of M. Laffitte's direction in 1878, wished to continue our contribution as a mark of the friendly feeling which ought, I thought and think, to exist between the French and English Positivists in spite of a difference of judgment. My wish to continue it was not welcome to my French colleagues, but they acquiesced in my decision. As I said in my original circular, I in no way looked on the Positivist fraternity as broken by any such difference. I considered that, as before, so after, the two bodies should co-operate, so avoiding any nationalism. In what spirit I have been met I will not here discuss as regards the past; but a document issued last year by the adherents of M. Laffitte in Paris and in London puts an end to all prospect of conciliation, and I propose at once definitively to withdraw our collective support of the Paris organisation under M. Laffitte. The address contained in this paper, "a protest against the Lemos circular," was accepted by him, be it remembered, and he is therefore fully responsible for it. I have, perhaps unwisely, continued this subscription in spite of his prolonged misdirection. I do not withdraw it now because of that misdirection, but from the conviction that it is most undesirable to uphold any longer the body which could originate such a manifesto.

I have the less hesitation in taking this step on account of another event of the past year. The Brazilian and Chilian Positivists have renounced M. Laffitte's direction, substantially on the same ground as that which we took in 1878. We have thus two groups of Latin and Southern origin breaking off from him. In their case no spirit of nationalism could be suspected. Coinciding with their general judgment, we may take the same course as they have taken, and the independent concert of such diverse groups will then express identity of practical conclusions with a similar basis of disagreement wholly apart from any national considerations.

To conclude this subject of the fund, I add that all who read the circulars of Auguste Comte, and they deserve constant study, will see the importance attached to the institution during the transition period. This justifies me in dwelling on it, whilst I would put no pressure on individuals. The uses to which it is applied I submit to the judgment of the subscribers.

The important publications of the year are three.

The first, due to Mr. Blake entirely—this I wish to acknowledge most clearly—is the republication, with one exception, of the series of essays known as *International Policy*. Its lowered price will greatly

facilitate its distribution. The principles it advocates are as much wanted as ever.

The second is the Italian translation, by Walter Congreve, of the *Positivist Catechism*, justly called by M. Laffitte 'the most elementary book and the most in use in Positivist teaching.' When shall we have it in German?

The third is the exceptional volume which contains Auguste Comte's will, his confessions, and his correspondence with Madame Clotilde de Vaux. The full importance of this volume will be of slow and very gradual recognition. It is most instructive immediately in its bearing on the discussions that are going on within the body of his disciples. It should put an end at once to all attempts to claim for M. Laffitte his master's recognition of him as his successor. All can now verify the truth of my assertion that any such claim was utterly groundless.

We have lost by death during the year several of our co-religionists, some in ripe age, some very prematurely. MM. Magnin and Hadéry are of the former class; Dr. Sémérie, and a young English Positivist, Mr. Saul, of the latter. The high estimation in which Auguste Comte held the two first-mentioned is well known, and the many who knew M. Magnin saw its justification, though at times they might differ with that eminent disciple in his judgments and actions. M. Hadéry was less known. I only speak of him here because of a question which his action raises. He was the recipient of Mr. Winstanley's gift of £10,000. The object of that gift was to establish a model farm. It was, I need not say, a premature act, and it ended in a complete failure. The sum was larger too than was warranted by the means of the donor, and he felt very painfully that he had, for no good result, seriously overburdened an already over-charged property.

During his lifetime, as executor of Winstanley and as co-executor of Auguste Comte, I asked M. Hadéry at a meeting of the executors to give an account to the Society of what, if a plenary gift, a gift given out and out, was yet a social gift, and as such ought to be accounted for to the Society. The obligation to give such account was recognised but never discharged.

I have always thought, as cognisant of the main facts of the case, that all that could be spared, if there were anything, should have returned to the impoverished estate. But I knew Winstanley's wish to be that M. Hadéry should not be disturbed. On his death, I thought it right to urge on some of the leading Positivists in France, the recovery, if there were anything to recover, for the said estate of what was left. It seems to me that, as Positivists, it was incumbent on us to do what we could to repair an evil which had arisen through an impulse of the most generous kind on behalf of our work. It did not seem to me that it was open to us to acquiesce in any application of the sum in question to general Positivist purposes. The question is, I find, very much simplified by M. Hadéry's will, which leaves all to M. Laffitte. This, he quite honourably, but as I think mistakenly, interprets not as a personal bequest, but as a bequest to Positivism. I publicly invite him to reconsider this decision and see whether it would not be better for the general interest of our cause to take into account the strong moral claim, as I judge it, of Winstanley's estate. Be it much or little, whatever is left should return to it, and the intention would be appreciated if the result were insignificant. It is most especially incumbent on Positivists to recognize fully such moral claims.

Dr. Sémérie's loss has been beautifully appreciated by Dr. Audiffrent in an address at his grave, which I hope before long to present to our

English public, as translated by Mr. Nicholson. Whatever differences there were between us, I feel that his death leaves a real gap in the ranks of Positivism, for which he had struggled long, zealously, and with great effect, and at fifty-one so much is cut short before the time.

Still more untimely was the death of Mr. Norman Saul, a young Northumbrian Positivist, of Blaydon-upon-Tyne, near Newcastle. He was but twenty-five. His loss is keenly felt by all who knew him, so attractive was his nature by its firmness and gentleness. His acceptance of the Religion of Humanity, his devotion to it, and his determination to make it the real guiding influence of his life were all complete. Hence we have to lament a rare promise unfulfilled. He joins that body of our own dead which already weighs with such a strong and elevating yet saddening influence upon us, the survivors, in our continuance of the common work.

The year has been one of considerable internal activity. I have before me besides the two regular circulars, *i.e.*, M. Laffitte's and my own, five others—which I mention in the order in which they reached me.

1. From Brazil a collective circular addressed to all true disciples of Auguste Comte.

2. The Parisian document above alluded to, entitled 'Protest against the Lemos Circular.'

3. A circular letter from Dr. Audiffrent, also addressed to all true disciples of Auguste Comte.

4. From Chili a circular from Dr. Jorge Lagarrigue to Positivists.

5. A letter from Dr. Nyström to all true Positivists.

There were besides two other letters from M. J. E. Lagarrigue, one to Dr. Robinet, the other to Dr. Bridges, bearing on the general question.

It would take too long to comment on all these documents. Together they throw great light on the actual situation of Positivism. They leave us much to regret. But there is compensation in the living energy they evidence, and in the confidence which animates them all as to the future of the great doctrine. There is anticipation of trouble but not of failure.

The issue is a very simple one at bottom. Shall we accept Auguste Comte's direction or M. Laffitte's? Nowhere does this issue come out more strongly than in the Parisian manifesto which, reduced to its essential meaning, is a demand for unlimited adherence to the director therein acknowledged, even when he is in open contradiction with his master. It is in this respect, nor only in this respect, a very singular paper. It is unbrotherly to other Positivists, it is undutiful to our common Master. I leave it to the judgment of the more dispassionate who may take an interest in the questions it raises, adding only that those who would infer from it unanimity among the Parisian Positivists should read Dr. Nyström's letter, which affirms and comments on the absence of such unanimity.

The South American Positivists, Brazilian and Chilean, are clear in their judgment on this simple issue. Letter after letter contains the same decision. They will adhere to Auguste Comte in full discipleship, and the vigour of their utterance, if here and there we might wish it more tempered, is very refreshing. It breathes a spirit of entire devotion to our great Master which has been too rare among us, and from which many, both in France and England, are more and more inclined to shrink.

With slight differences as to form of expression, at times even to the ground taken, with occasionally some regret where there is over-warmth,

I am in full accord on all essential points with their judgment, their spirit, and their method—the true Positivist method of perfect openness in statement and action, and I regret and blame the way in which they have been treated both in Paris and London. I notice by the way that there is a difference in this respect. The Chilian group is not attacked at all. It was only from Dr. Robinet's letter given in the Paris paper that I could infer its agreement with the Brazilian. Later, I received its manifesto also. I cannot explain this difference, for the Chilian dissent is as explicit, its judgment as unfavourable to M. Laffitte as the Brazilian, and substantially on the same grounds. Possibly other publications will explain the silence in regard to it.

There is a passage in Auguste Comte's will which I would here recall. It is in the second appendix, where he is speaking of the objections to his will raised by some of his executors. He goes on to say (page 27, at bottom): 'These conflicts, always imminent, are a consequence of the scepticism which was the previous condition of nearly all my present disciples, and they constitute the most painful fatality in the unexampled situation in which I am placed as a renovator. Whilst St. Paul and Mohammed, in the midst of furious struggles, obtained adherents of the completest devotedness, I am liable, without any attack from without, at any given moment, to be abandoned by all my disciples by virtue of the habits due to their original negativism.' He could only, he added, surmount this evil by living to such an age that his influence might be brought to bear on the children of his actual disciples. This he did not live to see. The devotion which Comte wished for and failed to secure is gradually coming into existence after his death. But even then it will excite in many minds opposition, perhaps even repugnance, and that amidst his disciples. Yet it is curious to observe that there is an agreement in principle as to the desirability of such devotedness—the difference arising as to its object. The complete submission which was and is denied to Comte is claimed by the Paris followers, and to a large extent by the Newton Hall followers, of M. Laffitte for this latter. It is but a substitution—an imprudent one—of the disciple for the master. I have known both, personally and from their works, and can have no temptation to join in such substitution. Rather I watch with pleasure the gradual rise of a determined spirit of submissive veneration for our glorious founder. It will sweep over the Positive body at no distant period with irresistible force, brushing away all obstacles which opportunism or timidity throw on its path. There is no danger really as we are at present from exaggeration. A religion will not spread by veiling all its doctrines, or by a hesitating and critical acceptance of such as may seem palatable to the outer world. Auguste Comte knew what he was about. We may follow him in confidence and by greater obedience rise gradually to the level of his conceptions, leaving to the future generations the power which is inherent in them of dealing with those conceptions according to their wants.

These various circulars have another good in them. They wake us up and force us all to think out the whole subject. We see more clearly how difficult and complex is the work we have in hand, how it needs patience and strenuous effort, as well as a most cool, if a most firm, judgment on the diverse forms of action which are adopted.

The irritation caused by all the discussion is a passing evil. It will not be removed by any such remedy as that which Dr. Nyström recommends. The community of aim which underlies all our differences—the community of difficulties in which we find ourselves—to these we must trust. The open avowal of disagreement has placed us all in a truer

position, and we can now work on in independent union. Premature attempts at unity have been our great mistake in the past. If the traces of them could wholly disappear we should be acting peaceably on the wise plan indicated by Auguste Comte. Practically, we have returned to his plan; its full adoption on principle by all Positivists would be a most acceptable calumet. A spiritual power, M. Laffitte once said, must look to voluntary adherents for its support. Pursue this statement to its full conclusion, and the soreness which accompanies our actual state might be largely assuaged if not entirely removed. Exaggerated claims offensively urged can do no good; and they are, it should be remembered, utterly beyond enforcement at present.

Throughout the Positivist body, as far as I can see, there is absolute unity of feeling in one point, viz.: in the wish to see Paris take its due place as the centre of the whole movement—Paris as the true representative of France. There is generally felt a deep regret that we cannot see that, under present circumstances, it does take that due place. We who fail to see this deplore the weakness consequent on its failure, and look forward in patient hope to a better future. Turn where I may, the result of all communications I receive whenever the subject is discussed at all is, as I have said, a perfect accord in the above wish. We are more or less sanguine, more or less discouraged. Some think that the existing elements may be so used as to give us what we want, others that we can expect nothing till a new departure is made; but all are at one in seeing that we shall be comparatively powerless till a direction issue from Paris which all shall feel to be worthy of their free adhesion and devoted support.

Auguste Comte felt and suffered from the conspiracy of silence, as he termed it. I have often heard his Parisian disciples loud in their indignation at the same system as operating against themselves. They, and the same is true in the main of the Newton Hall body, have learnt the lesson, however, and practice it consistently towards all their fellow believers who disagree with them. All Positivist effort outside their own is ignored. I speak for the period up to the close of 1884. The policy is unwise, even childish, at variance with one great maxim of our system which enjoins living openly, and moreover, it tends to increase the discord, to prolong, not to open the way for closing, the disunion. As we proceed it will have to be abandoned in presence of facts. I see no reason myself to shrink from the utmost openness in statement as to our condition, and I would be as unexclusive as possible.

In this unexclusive spirit let us call to mind the actual state of the Positivist movement. In groups or scattered, its disciples are found in many different countries—its influence is felt where there is no group nor even isolated disciple, at least as far as we know,—France, Belgium, Sweden, Italy, Hungary, Russia, England, Scotland, Ireland, Hindostan, North and South America, Anglo-Saxon and Latin America—more visibly in Latin America—Australasia, what a large extent of the earth's surface is included in this list, which is not an idle boast. If the group attract the more attention it is not always the more inherently powerful—an isolated disciple may be under given circumstances more so. Both at any rate conspire to one given end.

So regarded, the Positivist church is a collective spirituality, and it cannot at present take any other form. A great concentration, with all the intensity of power it would give us, is as yet unattainable, as we judge, in any case unattained as a fact. But in its dispersed form it can act with force on the discordant milieu in which it moves, if only it direct wisely its exertions—judge rightly what is the true sphere of its action.

The separation of the two powers—the right settlement of the difficult questions that concern industry—we all feel that both these points are most important. But the more immediate field of our collective action does not lie there. Our Master told us that the new spiritual power must first make itself felt where the failure of its predecessors was most apparent, in regulating the largest relations of man, the relations between the nations. The present time amply justifies his counsel. It really leaves us no choice. In former years it seemed open to us to select our point for action, as things are it is not so. After a grave internal conflict, which by its unwise conclusion has left the seeds of future evil in Europe, the European West is seeking ease for itself by throwing itself on the weaker peoples, and the conditions created by this new direction of its energies may easily be seen to close the hope of immediate attention to the grave political problems above-mentioned. A revival of militarism will be, nay is, accompanied by a revival—hollow enough no doubt, and doomed to be transient, but yet for the time undeniable,—a revival of theology, and under the influences of this retrograde combination is it probable that the newer conceptions will make way? So again is it probable that the welfare of the industrial classes will be beneficially affected by the diversion of attention from it to external interests, or that the careful husbanding of the material resources of men on which their state so largely depends is compatible with the wasteful processes of war? The nascent human spirituality will find it hard to gain a hearing under these conditions. But its growth and its influence depend upon its persistence in the endeavour to gain that hearing, and the retrospect of the past as to its success is by no means such as to discourage us. Nay, must not those who most insist on the necessity of its distinct existence, allow that by proving in fact its distinctness it best insures its ulterior formal separation—its independent existence—that such independent existence first becomes a fact, and then obtains that formal recognition.

The limits of a circular forbid a full treatment of such a subject. But for the practical carrying out of the principles summarily indicated, is not the state of the collective spirituality which the Positivist body actually constitutes singularly favourable? There is great power in the one dissentient, in the single voice. How greatly is the power multiplied if in country after country this single voice makes itself heard, and if in many cases the single voice has become the language of a small but active group. Each utterance gains by the other, and as the community of feeling in different countries cannot bear the impress of national self-interest—is even seen manifestly to discard any such lower motive,—it tells much more powerfully than we are prepared to think.

I have said before I should be glad if this common feeling had a central expression. Echoed as it is however from one country to another, it promises the supply of the want which becomes more and more felt, from the contrast of the wishes of the body as a whole, and the misleading direction which is offered by the director of the largest group of French Positivists.

Whilst I recognise, then, the evils of premature unity, I see none the less the great advantages of unity were it possible. Restricted, however, as we are by our circumstances, to union as a preparation, the union should be as close as possible. There must be independence, but it should be our object to bring our action into accord. We shall, in fact, be strong in proportion as we do so. I content myself with this statement, leaving it to the reflection of all who are in general agree-

ment with me. It can only be from their own conviction that any useful acceptance of it can come.

RICHARD CONGREVE,

Born at Leamington Hastings, Warwickshire,

September 4, 1818.

55, Palace Gardens Terrace,
London, W.

(I.)—*The Sacerdotal Fund.*

	£	s.	d.
Balance from previous years.....	286	6	8
Deduct for Printing Fund	86	6	8
In hand	£200	0	0

(II.)—*Subscriptions for the year 96 (1884).*

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Occidental... 129	Minimum	0	0	6	308	2
		2	7	9½		
		50	0	0		
Oriental 6	Minimum	0	8	4	11	0
	Mean	1	16	8		
	Maximum	7	10	0		
Total..... 135	Total.....	£319	2	7		

(III.)—*Expenses for the year 96 (1884).*

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Deficit on previous year				10	15	7
London Room:—						
Rent	55	0	0			
Gas and Firing	5	11	10			
Wages	48	18	0			
Repairs and Furniture.....	6	4	6			
Various Items	5	2	8			
Social Meetings	1	9	0			
Organ	10	0	0			
				132	6	0
Paris Subscription	40	0	0			
Birmingham Room	27	9	3			
Newcastle Room	30	0	0			
Leicester	5	0	0			
M. Lemos, in aid of Printing.....	25	0	0			
Mr. Quin	20	0	0			
				147	9	3
Administration				28	11	9
Total				£319	2	7

	£	s.	d.
(IV.)—Amount for the year 90 (1878)	156	13	0
" " " 91 (1879)	260	0	0
" " " 92 (1880)	325	19	6
" " " 93 (1881)	283	16	11
" " " 94 (1882)	264	19	4
" " " 95 (1883)	320	12	6
" " " 96 (1884)	319	2	7

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

LOVE FOR PRINCIPLE
AND ORDER FOR BASIS;
PROGRESS FOR END.

LIVE FOR OTHERS.

LIVE OPENLY.

EIGHTH ANNUAL CIRCULAR

ADDRESSED TO EVERY SUBSCRIBER TO THE VOLUN-
TARY FUND INSTITUTED BY AUGUSTE COMTE ON
BEHALF OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF HUMANITY.

London, 15 Moses 98 (15 January, 1886).

The formation of the Positivist Priesthood is become the first condition of a renovation which is as imperatively demanded by order as by progress.

Positivists at the outset had to ascend from faith to love, but henceforward they should give the preference to the more rapid and more effective method which leads downward from love to faith.

AUGUSTE COMTE.

SIR,

As usual, the financial statement is given at the end of the circular. The general result is a small diminution in the amount received—a larger decrease in the number of subscribers, due to the cessation of a collective subscription given or promised during the last two years. Apart from this, our numbers continue much the same, new subscribers taking the place of the vacancies caused by death or withdrawal. The sum subscribed meets our most necessary wants. But an increase of its amount—a broadening of its basis by an increase also in the number of subscribers—more regular and earlier payment, enabling me to see what can be undertaken—on all these points we need to advance. Subscription, it should be remembered, does not imply adhesion. There may be some who are ready to help but who have no wish to be counted as Positivists. Their assistance should have a distinct recognition in the financial statement.

The application of the fund calls for no special remark. It is, as always, submitted to the judgment of the contributors. I should not notice the withdrawal of our subscription to M. Laffitte's fund, were it not for a remark of Dr. Audiffrent's in the preface of his pamphlet, entitled '*Le Temple de l'Humanité*.' In a note to p. 5 he says: 'Since

this was written Mr. Congreve has made his submission to M. Laffitte.' This is wholly without foundation, as my circulars show. Whilst on this subject, I may say I do not accept Dr. Audiffrent's statement as to our separation, viz. : that it was due chiefly to me. With regard to his other judgments, I am content to leave them for the present to the appreciation of his readers. We shall not gain much by discussion of 'latent deviations.' It ought to be said, however, that our separation was not owing to any difference of opinion on the particular point in question, i.e., this latent deviation I mean, but to a disagreement as to the practical management of our common movement.

Keeping strictly to the year 97 (1885), our publications have not been numerous. The most important by far is Mr. Cotton's small volume,* 'New India.' Both in India and in England this will receive the attention it deserves as a most thoughtful contribution to the solution of the problem : What are to be the relations of the two countries during the period of their connection ?

On subjects of a kindred nature, two short protests have been issued, one on the war in the Soudan, the other on the annexation of Burmah, both bringing to bear on questions of international policy the great principle of the subordination of Politics to Morals.

Lastly, in quite a different sphere of thought, I have to mention 'Arithmetical,'† by Mr. Homersham Cox, junr.

I give in a note a list of some other publications which have reached me during the year, without professing to make the list complete.

Death has been very busy with us during the year, and again in most cases it has come prematurely. Our first loss was in India, in the person of a young Hindu barrister, who had but recently joined the Positivist body. Adhor Lall Sen was killed by a fall from his horse quite early in the year, thus abruptly closing a career which might have been of the greatest service, seeing what were his position and attainments. Towards the close of the year we lost Mr. Cleveland, who had been long connected by a more or less close tie with the Positivist action in the United States, and who of late had completely accepted the Religion of Humanity. He saw the great need there was of it for his country, and the impotence of all other plans for remedying the evil of the existing social order. I am giving the general purport of a letter which I received from him unexpectedly about three years ago.

I would not omit the name of Dr. Stievenard, a Belgian Positivist of long standing and residing at Mons.

NOTE.—*The Annual Address*, 1st January, 1885; London. H. J. Cotton.—*Annual Address, and Address on Sacrament of Maturity*. Jogendra Chandra Ghosh.—(1) *Address on the Festival of all the Dead*; (2) *Chaitanya's Ethics*; Calcutta. Dr. Audiffrent.—(1) *Le Temple de l'Humanité*; (2) *La Vierge-Mère*; Paris. William Frey.—*Under what conditions can Positivism successfully compete with Socialism?* London. Miguel Lemos.—(1) *Rapport pour l'année*, 1883; (2) *Sacramento da Apresentação*; (3) *O Calendario Positivista*; (4) *Circular on Mr. Cotton's Annual Address*; (5) Danton, Miguel Lemos and Montenegro Cordeiro; Rio de Janeiro. R. Teixeira Mendes.—(1) *A Harmonia Mental*; (2) *A Proposito de um pretendido Erro de Augusta Comte*. Juan Enrique Lagarrigue.—(1) *Lettre aux positivistes français*; (2) *Deuxième Lettre aux positivistes français*; Santiago de Chile. Henry Edger.—*Auguste Comte and the Middle Ages*; Pozsony. Presburg. Roberto Ardigo.—*La Morale dei Positivisti*. (3rd Volume of 'Opere Filosofiche;') Padova, 1885.

* C. Kegan Paul & Co., Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road, London, W.C.

† Deighton & Bell, Cambridge; G. Bell, London.

Here in England we have had three serious losses—and all most premature. Dr. Baxter was but in his fortieth year, Mr. Findley was I believe not so much, Mrs. Albert Crompton was but thirty-five. I have elsewhere spoken more fully of each. Let it suffice then here to say, that in each of the three centres more particularly affected, as by the whole body of which those centres are parts, the loss is most heavily felt. Each had a special commemoration in our church in Chapel Street.

The other events in our movement in the course of the year which are worth, some a mere mention, others a longer explanation, are: (1.) The celebration of the 15th Anniversary of the opening of the room in Chapel Street. April 9th, 1870, was the day of its inauguration under the name of the Positivist School, a name in keeping with our then state and attitude, but which in due time was superseded by the present title as an indication of the higher destination of our efforts, of their predominantly religious character and aim. Chequered as has been the history of Positivism since the date referred to, there is no reason to doubt that a result of real value has been attained, that the visible centre then constituted has rendered possible other movements, whether friendly or unfriendly.

(2.) Two lectures given by me in the Green Street Rooms, Cambridge, in May.

(3.) The institution, as announced in the Annual Address for 97 (1885), of a new Festival in accordance with the paragraph which I take from the fourth volume of the '*Positive Politics*' (see p. 75, p. 357, E. Tr.) 'As for the second additional festival, a distinct explanation is here imperative. Its object is to lay a foundation for the adoration, the collective adoration, of the representatives of Humanity, by instituting the abstract worship of woman, through the medium of the public festival of the Virgin-Mother, a festival in which the organic transition will incorporate the best condensation of the Middle Ages. By adhering to the day appointed by Catholicism, the true believers will naturally awake in their Catholic brethren a sense of the power inherent in the relative religion to preserve and allow full growth to all the germs emanating from the absolute faiths. In this festival Sociolatriy will reconcile the three Monotheisms, by pointing out to Christian hearts the founder of Islam choosing the eminent Jewess as the highest type of the sex when initiating its just worship. This festival, about the middle of the year, will be the complement of that which marks its beginning, when the habitual use of the historical calendar shall have effected a sufficient recognition of the Virgin-Mother, as the spontaneous idealisation of Humanity.'

On the first occasion of this additional celebration, it was for all reasons most desirable to keep as close as possible to the hints contained in the paragraph quoted, and this idea presided over the address given. The general current of feeling, inside and outside the Positivist body, made me feel that the time was propitious for our increasing the number of our festivals by one so calculated to guide our quiet meditations on the great subjects which it concerns—the true position of woman, and the enforcement of a higher standard of purity amongst men. At the same time, our actual state and all the antecedents from which it has issued demanded a great moderation in putting forward the new institution. It is essential to make existing facts our basis of advance, and a chief fact in all such cases is the state of feeling which prevails in those we address. I do not think that of the Positivist body I am especially chargeable with undue conciliation of the susceptibilities of my country-

men, but within the sphere of strictly religious action I wish to be very cautious. We have time before us. The festival in question is meant to lay a foundation for the collective adoration of the representatives of Humanity, through the medium of her beautiful medieval type. But the type is not Humanity, neither are her representatives Humanity. To her both are referred by their very names. To place her in the supreme position, to deduce all obligations from her, is not this the method by which our thoughts will, under our peculiar historical traditions, be most safely directed to a right estimate of all secondary institutions?

(4.) The second meeting of the annual conference. It was thought desirable to adjourn it from June to August, though the attendance was rather lessened by the change. As it was, the social meeting on the Sunday evening, and the meeting for a review of our whole position and action on the Monday, formed fitting accompaniments to the new festival inaugurated on the 3rd of Gutenberg (Saturday, 15th August), and the administration of the Sacrament of Destination on the Sunday morning.

(5.) The Sacraments administered during the year. Their number naturally varies in each year, and in so small a body can never be great. It has been greater than usual in 97 (1885), and in some cases they have been of remarkable interest. All will feel this of the first—the Sacrament of Maturity conferred by Mr. Cotton, by delegation, on the leading Hindu Positivist, Babu Jogendra Chandra Ghosh, the natural head of Positivism in India. Representatives of the East and West meeting, many of them in complete religious agreement, others on more personal grounds, to witness the reception by an Eastern disciple of the new faith—a disciple of full moral and intellectual competence—of the special Sacrament adapted to his period of life—the Sacrament which consecrates to the service of Humanity all the powers of him who receives it, for the period of their ripest and soundest development (42-63)—such a celebration deserves our most thoughtful consideration to draw out its full import and its promise. The acceptance of the social consecration under all the existing conditions is a noble act of faith and service.

On a level in point of interest was the Sacrament which, at his request, I conferred on Mr. William Frey, a Russian gentleman, who in full maturity, at 46, after long exertions in the United States in the cause of the new Religion—exertions of late years mainly directed to influence his countrymen settled there—wished to devote himself to the same cause in Russia itself. The undertaking was an uncertain and hazardous one. Its results do not naturally come under our notice at present, they are rather for next year's circular. Be they what they may, the spirit which has throughout animated Mr. Frey is worthy of the amplest recognition, and no difference of judgment as to the form which we severally think the Positivist movement should take could warrant me in declining to accede to his request, which I give in his own words:

'Henceforth my life, whether in Russia or here, will be devoted only to the propaganda of the Religion of Humanity among Russians. Even that part of my work which will go to support my family will necessarily take a theoretical character (as my health disables me from active work), and will indirectly tend to the same end. And to consecrate to Humanity this mature and unflinching determination of mine, is the task which I asked you to perform in the presence of our co-religionists.'

We have here again an instance of the wide applicability of the Positive Religion, of its power to be the inspiration of a true church organisation, an organisation, that is, which traverses all local and

national differences. And it will be seen that in Mr. Frey's case the Sacrament was the consecration of a special apostolic career, deliberately undertaken after a long training, with a past of resolve and sacrifice to guarantee the future.

Within the limits of our English church there have been three Sacraments conferred at Liverpool—Presentation, Initiation, and Maturity. The Initiation of the first English child who was presented, fourteen years ago, in Chapel Street, coincided with the Maturity of her father. The consecration in this Sacrament of Mr. Albert Crompton was also the ratification of a joint service given ungrudgingly in the past, and to be continued in the future with the firmest devotion, as the common contribution of two inseparable lives.

I have spoken in my Annual Address of the other Sacraments administered in London. I may be briefer on them here, merely enumerating the two Presentations and the Admission, and calling the attention of those who may not see the address to the two instances of the Sacrament of Destination. The peculiar interest of these last lies in their being in both cases destinations to the priestly office. The acceptance of such destination is a fact of great significance,—I repeat what I have said elsewhere,—of great encouragement.

I agree with those who think that all the other questions which are so agitated about us are of trivial importance in comparison with that of religion, and hence it is that I recur with pleasure to the Sacraments which are from time to time administered. For whatever be their after effect on those who take them, they witness to the acceptance of a purely religious consecration of our human existence through certain social rites; and they are an acknowledgment that our Positivist life is throughout one of religious obligation. By outward and visible forms we, as our Christian predecessors, identify ourselves with the Power we serve, whilst we avoid any admixture of the very noble but mystical conceptions which have made the Christian Sacraments the source of such insoluble difficulties.

On a review of the whole Positivist situation I have little to add to what I said last year. The world around us is much as it was, and consequently the obstacles to the growth of the Religion of Humanity are as they were, certainly not lessened. For ourselves, and this is in all respects the more important question, the one great want remains unmet. We still want and wait for a wise central direction, and such central direction must come from France. In its absence we are comparatively powerless.

We may be more or less conscious of this want, but we all feel it in a degree; to what degree we have felt it would be best seen were it satisfied.

Or to proceed from another point.

The disorder, the anarchy, the mutual repulsion of the several constituents of the West, its oppressive and purely selfish action, severally and conjointly, as regards the less advanced populations, how are these evils to be removed, so long as no one state is so ordered as to free itself from all complicity with them, and thus afford a nucleus for all similar movements? The other Western States may help by preparing themselves for adherence to such nucleus, but it can be formed by no other State than France. This is as true now as ever. But till France develops in full her growing disposition to resume her noblest traditions, to give their due sway to her best instincts, to abjure all territorial expansion, all material supremacy, and foster within herself the true spiritual leadership of the West which the past confers

upon her, the union with her which is a deep desire in the world under all present counter-indications cannot be solid because of the uncertainty attendant on her imperfect mastery of her real destination. Let France accept the position assigned her by Humanity, and she will see the nations gather round her; she can hardly perhaps realise with what a power and rapidity.

Meanwhile there can be no well-founded confidence in European order till France and England act in concert, and the degree in which those who direct our foreign policy recognise this is the measure of their statesmanship. So that the general want of the world is the same as that of our own nascent church.

On more than one occasion during the past year have I dwelt on our relation to France, on our duty to work in all ways towards a full union whenever it shall be practicable. The subject, therefore, finds naturally its place in this circular, and it is essential to recall it at a time like the present when every stimulus is being applied to our nationalism, the parent of so much evil in our history, and so pregnant with evil for the generations to come.

RICHARD CONGREVE,

Born at Leamington Hastings, Warwickshire,

September 4th, 1818.

(I.)—*The Sacerdotal Fund.*

Balance from previous years £200 0 0

(II.)—*Subscriptions for the year 97 (1885).*

		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Occidental 96	{ Minimum.....	0	0	6	292	13	9
	{ Mean.....	3	1	0			
	{ Maximum.....	50	0	0			
Oriental 8	{ Minimum.....	0	6	3	10	2	1
	{ Mean.....	1	5	3			
	{ Maximum.. ..	4	18	6			
Total... 104					Total	£302	15 10

(III.)—*Expenses for the year 97 (1885).*

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
London Room :—						
Rent	55	0	0			
Gas and Firing	4	8	6			
Wages	46	10	0			
Repairs and Furniture	27	14	0			
Various Items	3	10	8			
Social Meetings	2	13	0			
Organ	12	0	0			
				151	16	2
Birmingham Room	24	0	0			
Newcastle Room.....	30	0	0			
Cambridge	1	5	0			
Mr. Quin	40	0	0			
Minor Expenses	2	2	10			
Subscription for last year (promised, but not paid)	2	2	0			
				99	7	10
Administration				30	0	0
Total Expenses.....				281	4	0
Balance				21	11	10
				£302	15	10

	£	s.	d.
(IV.)—Amount for the year 90 (1878).....	156	13	0
" " " 91 (1879).....	260	0	0
" " " 92 (1880).....	325	19	6
" " " 93 (1881).....	283	16	11
" " " 94 (1882).....	264	19	4
" " " 95 (1883).....	320	12	6
" " " 96 (1884).....	319	2	7
" " " 97 (1885).....	302	15	10

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

LOVE FOR PRINCIPLE
AND ORDER FOR BASIS;
PROGRESS FOR END.

LIVE FOR OTHERS.

LIVE OPENLY.

NINTH ANNUAL CIRCULAR

ADDRESSED TO EVERY SUBSCRIBER TO THE VOLUN-
TARY FUND INSTITUTED BY AUGUSTE COMTE ON
BEHALF OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF HUMANITY.

LONDON, 15 Moses 99 (15 January, 1887).

The formation of the Positivist Priesthood is become the first condition of a renovation which is as imperatively demanded by Order as by Progress.

Positivists at the outset had to ascend from faith to love, but henceforward they should give the preference to the more rapid and more effective method which leads downward from love to faith.

AUGUSTE COMTE.

SIR,

The financial statement given at the end of this circular shows a small increase in the amount received, a larger increase in the number of subscribers. The sum subscribed still meets our most necessary wants. But a growth is desirable. It continues true that the fund rests on too narrow a base; that the payments are made too late in the year and too irregularly, more than a third not coming in till the middle or end of December. I again state that subscription does not imply adhesion, but merely the wish to help a movement to which, under certain aspects, importance or value is attached. Whilst then it is the sign of adhesion when adhesion is given fully, it is always open to a subscriber to limit it to a general support. There are at least two such cases this year, and the distinction is fully recognised. The accounts show a balance in our favour of £95 1s. 3d., but of this £90 are promised, leaving therefore only £5 1s. 3d. to be brought forward for the present year.

Throughout my remarks I keep strictly to the year 98 (1886). The publications, so far as I have received them, are as follows:—

- (1.) The Annual Address in London on the Festival of Humanity.
- (2.) Ditto by Mr. Cotton. Calcutta.
- (3.) An address by Dr. Carson.
- (4.) By Mr. Jogendra Chandra Ghosh.
 - (a.) Address on the Festival of the Dead.
 - (b.) Caste Reform.
- (5.) 2nd Edition of the Positivist Tables, revised and augmented. (Reeves & Turner, 196, Strand.)
- (6.) Dr. Audiffrent. (a.) Lettre à M. Lemos.
(b.) Circulaire exceptionnelle.
- (7.) M. Miguel Lemos. Rapport pour l'Année 1884.
- (8.) M. Lagarrigue (Juan Enriqué).
 - (a.) 2^{ème} lettre aux Positivistes français.
 - (b.) Los desafios ante la Moral Positiva y la Senda do Porvenir.
 - (c.) Circular Religiosa.
- (9.) M. Lagarrigue (Dr. Jorge).
 - (a.) Sacrement de la Présentation.
 - (b.) Circulaire.
 - (c.) Circulaires annuelles d'Auguste Comte.
- (10.) Mr. Patrick Geddes. The Conditions of Progress of the Capitalist and of the Labourer.
- (11.) Mr. Vernon Lushington. The Worship of Humanity.
- (12.) Centenary of Frederic the Great; Signed by E. S. BEESLY, on behalf of his Society.

Mr. Cotton's 'New India' is being translated into the vernacular languages—an evidence of the attention it has excited.

Death has visited us less than usual. It has been an anxious time for more than one of our body, but there has been only one death in connection with us. Mr. John Robert Logan, of Easington Lane, Durham, originally entered into communication with Mr. Quin, and subsequently with me, sending me the minimum subscription and wishing for books. A liberal and a secularist previously, he says to Mr. Quin: 'I am tired of mere negation, which has been my mental food for the last eleven years. Previous to that metaphysics had been my study, and not having mental power enough to grasp it (if it is possible for any one to do so thoroughly) I may be said to be in a state of mind suited to receive the doctrine of Positivism.' I quote these words to give a fair idea of his position in relation to our cause. He wrote in suffering to both of us, and we shortly after heard of his death. He was one of the librarians to a library in Easington Lane and Liberal Secretary, so that he was well situated for spreading the knowledge of the new Faith. The directness and simplicity of his letters make one still more regret his loss.

884 The continuity of our action in London has been maintained by the ungrudging aid of our members—especially of Mr. Sulman and Mr. Henry Crompton. The annual conference met in May. Such a meeting offers an opportunity of bringing the various centres into more thorough communication with one another, so as to give us that mutual knowledge which is so desirable for the disciples of a common religion. The festivals previously instituted have been kept, and there have been two special commemorations: that of Joan Darc—a tribute so due from England to that most noble woman—the Maid of Orleans; and that of Frederic the Great of Prussia, as the highest representative of true modern statesmanship during the revolutionary transition—a commemoration the more needful as the revolutionary feeling recoils from the recognition.

The administration of the social Sacraments—one of the two divisions of the domestic worship—has in London included three Initiations and one Presentation. Two of the former were under fully normal conditions, one under special conditions, but all three were intelligently and deliberately accepted. I add here that the Sacrament of Presentation has been conferred at Leicester by Dr. Carson; and in connection with the whole question, I refer in conclusion to the sacramental act in ratification of his acceptance of the full Positivist marriage by Mr. Albert Crompton. The solemn renewal of the promise of eternal widowhood six months after the expiration of the year of mourning is the act to which I refer. Its significance comes home to all Positivists.

Year by year as these consecrations occur they bear witness to the power of the new Faith to regulate all our life in its multiplex relations—and to those who receive them they offer a great support. By their insistence on human demonstrable duties, by their explanation of the several phases of man's existence, placing both duties and the divisions of life in their due connection and proportion, by their freedom from all admixture of mysticism, the Positivist human Sacraments clear up, for the immediate recipients and for all who take part in them, this our tangled existence, as they give it dignity and consistence.

I turn now to the other centres in England or elsewhere in this yearly review of the general situation, which as Positivists we ought to keep constantly before us, by the aid of such generality of view counter-acting all local narrowness, the insular narrowness which meets us at every turn. I regret the change which has taken place in Birmingham, where there is no longer any collective action. I regret it, but it was necessary. I could not but bow to facts and see that the maintenance of a room there was an useless burden at present. There have been always great difficulties in Birmingham. They have proved too great for one particular form of action. We must wait. The Positivists in Birmingham will watch their opportunities for a renewal of combination. They may surely meet from time to time, in however small numbers, and gradually form a nucleus from which a new and sounder public organisation may in time issue. Nothing is lost, it may be said with truth, in the social any more than in the physical world. The exertions hitherto made guarantee in one shape or another a continuance of endeavour.

In Newcastle and in Leicester the work is carried on with quiet determination, in the true way, from within outwards. The spirit of union and devotedness which prevails must tell on the surroundings when time has allowed it to have its due effect. The troubled world in which we work can only be influenced powerfully by combined action,

and it will be influenced by that, whatever its scale, if it persist. And it will persist when it rests on common feelings and habits, based on community of conviction.

In India there is growth—a steady, quiet growth. There we rest on the solid foundation of a favourable record. We have the memories and still living services of the Past continued in the Present. The dead and the living Positivists of Indian and European origin combine to constitute a body of advocates for a just policy in regard to India, which appeals strongly to the sympathies of those who are guiding its populations to a real national existence. The body thus formed links the East to the West, whilst it carefully avoids all intrusion on the East. Respect—more than respect even—for the past of India—the desire rather that our Indian co-religionists, whilst lending support to the proper Western movement, should mould all their action on their own national antecedents—this is at the root of all joint exertion. In the unity of Humanity a large amount of difference will long be accepted and acceptable, as imposed on us by our different histories. It is accepted with the knowledge that it will be constantly lessening as we proceed, with the conviction that it will ultimately disappear.

It is a pleasure to recognise the drawing nearer together of two centres such as London and Liverpool. The more concert can be established the better, but it must be a concert emanating voluntarily from a just independence. The two principles are always to be taken into account in all Positivist action. What, however, we all need to remember in this revolutionary age is that we lean more naturally to independence than to concert, and that the latter principle, though the weaker, ought to be the most prominent in our thought, as being our ultimate aim. The sign of the greater union of the two bodies is the avowed participation—a participation urged by Dr. Carson—in the central English fund, as a desirable evidence of a strict community of effort in the propagation of the New Faith as a religion, in a frankly religious form.

The Manchester Positivist movement holds a more neutral course as I understand it. Those who conduct it have, as we all have, no easy task: they have peculiar difficulties of their own. I have to acknowledge a very friendly reception, and a progressive spirit. Experience will show them what course to adopt; they will, with a due regard to their circumstances, conform to its teachings. In the meantime it is much that the existence of a new faith offering repose to the restless and the uncertain is proclaimed in that busy centre of human activity. Feeling the importance of this, I thought it wise to accept the invitation given me to take part in their meetings.

The two other London bodies, at Newton Hall and in the North of London, are, I believe, both successful, as success is at present estimated, by a reference to number that is. I imagine, too, they have greater success in regard to cohesion, the point in which our own movement is, whatever its cause, deplorably weak.

I would here correct an expression I used last year. I then spoke doubtfully of Sweden as a centre of Positivism. The hesitation disappears under better information. It is clear that there is a Swedish centre, with life and energy in it. I offer no criticism on the course pursued under very great obstacles from within and from without, but content myself with the broad fact, and with the hope that there may be a diminution of the obstacles, and that it may advance firmly on the course which it more and more considers right, that it may reach in form as well as in spirit a true religious presentment of our Faith.

From South America we have had the publications above mentioned. The report of M. Lemos extends only to the year 96 (1884). I hope we shall not wait long for the reports of the two next years (they perhaps will be condensed into one), so that we may be able to follow that important movement up to date. There is every reason to think that all is proceeding as before in both Brazil and Chili, under the persistent energy of the respective leaders. The visit paid us by Dr. Jorge Lagarrigue left us not only a very pleasant personal reminiscence, but afforded us a greater insight into the work of our South American *confrères*, into their aims and method. We were all stirred and encouraged by the contact with a leading representative of their body, giving a fuller sense of life to our inter-communion.

I have left French Positivism, as the most important, to the last. When I say French, I mean Parisian Positivism. The other centres in France, I have no doubt, continue their work, and possibly new ones have arisen, but I have no call to speak of them. It is emphatically to Paris, now as ever, that we all turn with anxious inquiry—for we all recognise our dependence for any real Western advance on the initiative of Paris. Such guidance as has been offered us we have been driven to look on as defective, we have waited therefore for something different. It has been increasingly evident to most of us that, to use a current phrase, a new departure is imperatively called for; whether on the part of those who have hitherto presided over the Parisian movement, which is possible, or taken by new men animated by a different spirit. In the actual change of our circumstances at Paris, there is real hope. For there is an essential change made in those circumstances if Dr. Lagarrigue is able to carry out his resolution of making Paris definitively his home and the centre for a distinctly religious propaganda. His resolution to this effect evidences exceptional devotion and courage. It will call for an exceptional patience. The obstacles are great—one of the greatest, in the present state of Europe, is his being a foreigner. We are far, in our divisions, from the medieval readiness to welcome an interchange of persons. In reliance on his cause and on his Master's teaching he is willing to face this and other hindrances and to work on in comparative solitude, in the uncertainty of a long deferred hope, in the certainty of an oppressive opposition. He has with him the noblest part of our Positivist past, the labours, the teachings, the life of Auguste Comte, over and above the consciousness that time is working effectually in his direction. Those who can appreciate his sacrifice and who feel in unison with his general purpose, will seek to aid him by their sympathy and with such other help as it may be in their power to give. In the degree in which our fund permits, I think it ought to assist him in making known his object and his work. There may be differences here and there as to the method to be pursued, but I make no doubt that the conduct of his cause will show him the true method. The position he occupies brings with it light.

The attitude which we have adopted as a body, what I have spoken of as the frankly religious attitude, will for some time probably slacken our course and give us but a slight increase of apparent success. That is no argument against its correctness—perhaps it rather makes for it on an appeal to earlier experience. We are, I am confident, in keeping with the general spirit of Auguste Comte's teaching; we are acting in obedience to his direction as he has left it expressed in his circulars and elsewhere. This may make us independent of the immediate results, which, however, if well sifted, I am in no way disposed to think slightly of, provided that we are not unduly swayed, as the temper of the day is,

by appearances. Look below the surface and there is good encouragement.

Be the actual prospect what it may under the sensible evil of our divisions, we may rely on the strength of our doctrine, and on the guiding and controlling power inherent in the construction outlined by our great Master. What we suffer from is but an illustration, from within, of his prediction that if he left his work incomplete, it would be a hard task to direct the West during the transition. With the security inspired by our reliance on him, we may watch with regret, but without alarm, concessions made which impair the social force of his religious conception, and direct attacks on his well-considered conclusions—from whatever quarter such attacks proceed.

In the limits of a circular I can only touch on one or two points which are in various degrees under discussion amongst us, and on which an open expression may have its use, by way of suggestion. One is, to what extent Auguste Comte's authority is to be accepted. It is an old and sound rule to steer in the direction of the least danger, and I estimate this, not as our open opponents or half friends would estimate it, not from without, but as from within, in reference, that is, purely to our own body—the aggregate of Positivists who accept the name. Thus examined the danger lies not as yet in our excess of deference to our common Founder, but in its defect. There is prevalent a fear of according him too much, a disposition to dwell on any points in which his decision does not agree with our own.

I would suggest that this critical, grudging attitude is a mistake for us, that on all disputed points it would be truer wisdom to accept his ruling with reverential deference, and where we differ to reserve our difference, not to put it forward. Following the general course of De Maistre's argument on the Pope's infallibility, viz., that it was but the necessary recognition of some final judgment in order to close disputes, the assertion in short of the same power as we grant to the highest legal tribunal,—the ultimate court of appeal in each country—it might be wise to adopt the same attitude in reference to Auguste Comte—submit even if we question. In a large proportion of cases the question would disappear as we gained deeper insight. This has been my experience, and not mine only. A practically unlimited submission is, I acknowledge, what I accept for myself, leaving it to time and the enlargement of human vision to justify or modify the conclusions which for the time are accepted as final. In this relative, human sense, there is no objection to use the term which may repel us at first, the term infallibility. We may thus avoid its being an occasion for division amongst us.

The second point is the conception of the Virgin-Mother. Here I would premise that we are at a real disadvantage from the misfortune of not having Comte's full treatment of the subject which was to find its place in his treatise on *Morals*. We have, be it remembered, also the fact to face that in the smaller works most accessible to and most used by Positivists, in many cases exclusively used, I mean the *Catechism*, the *General View*, and the *Circulars*, the point is not brought forward. The result is that it is not worked into the whole system as it stands before the world in its commonest form, but is a later creation. It were unwise to forget this when we are considering the ease or difficulty of its acceptance.

So much premised, I submit that there are two methods of dealing with the subject. I prefer at our present stage, and looking to the whole exigencies of our movement, to refer, in the words of Auguste Comte, all to Humanity; to preach Her in the first place, and then

examine what are the essential elements of Her religious system. The history of our predecessors is enlightening. The Eucharistic Sacrament, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the beautiful condensation of Medieval Catholicism, was not historically, is not in practice, the fundamental demand on the believer. It was an institution in support of the great foundation, to the full appreciation of which the believer comes gradually as he assimilates more thoroughly his whole belief. So it has been with us. We may advance far, the works of Comte prove it, into the Religion of Humanity before we come into contact with this latest conception. As we assimilate more and more the central conception of Humanity, we shall increasingly feel the want of a condensation analogous to the Christian condensation, and I am inclined to think that this is the way in which we shall come to see its deepest significance, its most practical value. Nor is it difficult even now to arrive at a conception of the Virgin-Mother of true practical utility. Let me to show this borrow the beautiful language of a prayer addressed to Humanity which has been placed in my hands: 'Thou thyself hast no peer, no companion: in this home of all of us, the Earth, in the Space that enfolds it thou workest by thyself alone—we worship thee then as Virgin as well as Mother.'

Such concentration giving force and vividness to all our feelings and thoughts about Humanity, may also be a clue for our farther advance.

With no mystery in it, avoiding mysticism, open on all points to discussion, the new Religion may proceed on its way without fear that our present deficiencies will interfere with its ulterior triumph. If I have touched on points where there is a liability to disagreement, it is because, remembering the different elements which constitute the Positivist aggregate, I would call attention to the necessity of tolerating variety in the respective approach of those elements to the definitive solution.

RICHARD CONGREVE,

Born at Leamington Hastings, Warwickshire,

September 4th, 1818.

55, Palace Gardens Terrace, Kensington,
London, W.

(I.)—*The Sacerdotal Fund.*

	£	s.	d.
Balance from previous years.....	221	11	10

(II.)—*Subscriptions for the Year 98 (1886).*

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Occidental... 128	(Minimum	0	1	0	309	4
	Mean	2	7	11		
	Maximum	50	0	0		
Oriental..... 14	(Minimum	0	3	0	13	5
	Mean	0	19	0		
	Maximum	3	15	0		
Total..... 142	Total.....	£322	10	0		
Add for Subscription of last Year.....		2	2	0		
Per sale of furniture at Birmingham		4	6	8		
		£328	18	8		

(III.)—*Expenses for the Year 98 (1886).*

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
London Room :—						
Rent	55	0	0	106	9	3
Gas and Firing.....	3	10	4			
Wages	30	4	0			
Various Items	3	17	11			
Social Meetings	1	17	0			
Organ	12	0	0			
Birmingham Room (for half year)	12	0	0	87	8	2
Newcastle Room	30	0	0			
Mr. Quin	42	10	0			
Minor Expenses	2	18	2			
M. Lemos, by Dr. Lagarrigue	10	0	0	40	0	0
Administration	30	0	0			
Total Expenses	233	17	5			
Balance	95	1	3			
Total.....	£328	18	8			

	£	s.	d.
(IV.)—Amount for the year 90 (1878)	156	13	0
" " " 91 (1879)	260	0	0
" " " 92 (1880)	325	19	6
" " " 93 (1881)	283	16	11
" " " 94 (1882)	264	19	4
" " " 95 (1883)	320	12	6
" " " 96 (1884)	319	2	7
" " " 97 (1885)	302	15	10
" " " 98 (1886)	322	10	0

KKK

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

LOVE FOR PRINCIPLE
AND ORDER FOR BASIS;
PROGRESS FOR END.

LIVE FOR OTHERS.

LIVE OPENLY.

TENTH ANNUAL CIRCULAR

ADDRESSED TO EVERY SUBSCRIBER TO THE VOLUNTARY
FUND INSTITUTED BY AUGUSTE COMTE ON BEHALF
OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF HUMANITY.

LONDON, 15, MOSES 100 (15 January 1888).

The formation of the Positivist Priesthood is become the first condition of a renovation which is as imperatively demanded by Order as by Progress.

Positivists at the outset had to ascend from faith to love, but henceforward they should give the preference to the more rapid and more effective method which leads downwards from love to faith.

AUGUSTE COMTE.

SIR,

The accounts show a small decrease in the number of subscribers, a small increase in the amount subscribed. The instability of conditions, convictions, and habits, explains a certain degree of fluctuation. It is still true that, whilst the base on which the fund rests is too narrow, we have enough for our present wants. I remark with pleasure that I have had less than in former years to remind subscribers. In such a matter, as generally, Positivists who recognise an obligation and wish to subscribe should act on their own impulse. If it were their habit to fix some day for their payment it would be easier to remember it. In the general want of discipline, regularity, even on one point, has its value. Our object is to introduce everywhere fixity and order, and each step makes the next easier.

The acquisition of a church and site at Newcastle explains the amount given to that centre. Pending the completion of the move to the new building, the room previously in use had to be continued and the rent ran on. Both payments are met from the year's income. Any charge for rent now ceases.

The payment to Leicester just meets the necessary expenses of the room, all else being left to the body there. I thought it right under all the circumstances to urge Mrs. Findley, though reluctant, to accept this small aid.

Carrying out what I said in my last circular (p. 6) in reference to Dr. Lagarrigue, I sent him on the 24th Gutenberg (5th September) the sum entered in the accounts. I give below the letter which accompanied the contribution*and in which I begged his acceptance of it.

So far for the application of the fund. In what follows I keep as closely as I can to the past year. It is not always possible quite to exclude the present when the environment is so constantly changing, but I shall do so as far as possible.

I have little to note in the way of publications, so far as they have reached me: they have been mainly the usual annual addresses and circulars. The most important addition is (1) the English translation of the Will of Auguste Comte, and the documents in immediate connection with it. The rest of the great book should be studied and digested in the original. I have received besides,

(2) Philosophie chimique, by M. Teixeira Mendes.

(3) Écriture chimique, by M. L. Méhay.

(4) Circulaire Positiviste, by Dr. Jorge Lagarrigue.

Lastly I may mention a new issue, it is the fourth edition, of the short collection of prayers, &c., we use in Chapel Street. It is about a third larger than the previous edition.

It is not a ritual which I attempt. It is my conviction that a ritual must wait, must be of gradual growth, as the series of public festivals instituted by the Sociolatrinal Table is of gradual introduction. As yet we celebrate, in such way as we can, only three of the eighty-one Festivals enumerated in that Table—the Festival of Humanity, the Festival of all the Dead, the Festival of Holy Women—the two last as common to the abstract and concrete worship. But when we meet for

22 Gutenberg 99 (3 Sept. 1887).

CHER MONSIEUR LAGARRIGUE,

Je vous prie au nom de la collectivité positiviste dont je centralise l'action, d'agréer l'envoi que je vous adresse sous la forme d'un *cheque* pour 21 livres sterling (525 fr.) Il vous parviendra, j'espère, le 24 Gutenberg, le 5 Septembre, jour si tristement cher à tout disciple d'Auguste Comte, et sera un témoignage de sympathie fraternelle et de synergie comme aide matériel et moral dans les difficiles conditions où vous place votre apostolat. Notre petite réunion du soir à Chapel Street pensera bien à vous.

Foi. Esperance. Amour.

Tout à vous,

RICHARD CONGREVE.

DEAR MR. LAGARRIGUE,

I beg you in the name of the collective Positivist body of which I centralise the action, to accept what I send in the form of a cheque for £21 (525 francs). It will reach you, I hope, the 24th Gutenberg, September 5th, a day so sadly dear to every disciple of Auguste Comte, and it will be an evidence of brotherly sympathy and co-operation as a material and moral support in the difficult circumstances in which you are placed by your apostolate. Our small meeting in the evening at Chapel Street will have you in its thoughts.

Faith. Hope. Love.

Yours truly,

RICHARD CONGREVE.

common worship, however domestic its character, we may avail ourselves of the traditional forms with the necessary changes. The same holds good of the social sacraments, which are integral portions of the domestic worship in the new religion. The substantial part of their administration is taken from the prescriptions of Auguste Comte; anything beyond is meant for an accompaniment and an elucidation. The collection, such as it is, offers this advantage, that it makes clear what our aim is,—a compensation for any disadvantages. It may help also to bring home to us all the need of a return to earlier practices, both for the family and the individual. The practice of a set form of expression as opposed to extempore prayer has, in my judgment, quite sufficient sanction in the long experience of the Christian Church.

We have lost during the year one younger Positivist, Mr. James Wallace Davidson, to the great regret of his own more immediate Newcastle friends, as well as to that of other Positivists who knew him. The rather slow advance which answered to his nature was compensated by its steadiness. I feel, he said to me, since I have become a Positivist, this great difference; I have now a purpose in all my work—a thing which before I had not. As so many others, he has passed away prematurely. Whilst speaking of the dead, I would express the sympathy which we all must feel with Dr. Robinet and his family, in their grief for the early death of Dr. Gabriel Robinet. No differences need affect this common human feeling.

What I said last year of our own work in London and in the centres with which I am in direct communication, holds good in the main for the present circular. There has been continuous effort throughout the year in Liverpool, Newcastle, and Leicester, as well as in London; as continuous an effort in Calcutta as their circumstances admitted. The strain is considerable to maintain such continuity. It would seem desirable to relieve it by as much flexibility in the form of our effort as is attainable.

In all the English centres mentioned, one or more of the Social Sacraments has been administered. There have been instances of Presentation, Initiation, Admission, Marriage, and Incorporation, together with a Pro-Sacrament of the nature of Destination, the consecration of a particular and limited function. The Marriage was in strict obedience to the prescriptions of Auguste Comte, with a full acceptance, that is, of all the conditions of Positivist religious marriage, with the full acknowledgment of the definite duties which the rite imposes.

A word or two here on India.

In Calcutta the movement advances steadily in point of number, but I do not assume that all who help it forward, whether Indians or English, accept Positivism as a whole. Where such acceptance is not explicit, I interpret the aid given as sympathy with the general direction of Positivist effort, possibly even agreement as far as the central idea of Humanity is concerned, with varying degrees of reserve as to the rest. This agreement is the essential point for the East, all beyond may be gradually added. The object is to spread as widely as possible the conception of the unity of East and West in Humanity, by virtue of which we may jointly work towards a common end, to the extinction of all jealousy and antagonism. The co-existence of centres in East and West—centres of thought and action for the furtherance of this object—and the persistent co-operation of such centres, are facts of great promise for the future. The well-determined aim of the co-operation is to put an end to the unsocial and immoral intrusion of the West on the East, to the oppression and disturbance of the East by such intrusion. In

this great work India, now awakening into just self-consciousness, may well take the position of leader.

Towards the close of last year my attention was drawn by a most valued friend to my action in regard to the Manchester group. I felt at the time that it was difficult, and I feel the difficulty still. My reasons for co-operating with that group were given in last year's circular, but they are thought inadequate and to involve myself and others in some perplexity.

Looking back this was what happened. When applied to in 1884 to be one of the speakers at Manchester I declined and induced others to decline. The address with which their course began in that year was, by its tone, an ample justification of my declining, though my decision as far as I can recollect was founded on what I knew of the general attitude of the promoters of the movement—an attitude entirely different from that which I have always taken both as regards persons and teaching. In the first invitation sent me I was told that the Manchester movement at present stood in close relation to Newton Hall, though *without any formal affiliation to it present or prospective*. A second invitation came two years later. I had in the interval been on friendly personal relations with the leaders of the movement, and had certainly the impression that they meant to be more neutral, and that they wished to advance more in my own direction. The service, I was told, as now arranged, will not differ very greatly from that at Chapel Street. And the general tendency towards a religious service rather than to a mere lecture was confirmed from another quarter. Under these circumstances, with considerable hesitation, I resolved to be as conciliatory as possible. It is very probable I went too far in this direction.

Manchester is now claimed by Newton Hall as directly affiliated to it. There is no neutral character attaching to it. So far there is a change. I see also that my action has been used to influence others. Both these points affect me unpleasantly, and make me more inclined to believe that I had better have stood aloof, as at first. I state the case as it appears to me and leave it to the judgment of others. So far, I ought to have been wiser; I have generally, almost universally, found, that neutrality as between the two bodies means joining Newton Hall. To any whom my mistake, supposing it to be judged one, has been a source of difficulty, I offer my apologies.

The point would not be important, but that it leads naturally to the further question of my relations to Newton Hall. It is asserted that there are no longer any differences between English Positivists—between the direction in Chapel Street and that which emanates from Newton Hall. I do not understand on what such an assertion rests; as far as I am concerned it is the purest invention, for which I can in no way be responsible, having given no countenance to it by speech or writing. I have been long aware that what is called a fusion of the two groups was desired and thought easy and natural by those who neither know the history of our differences nor care to enter into the reasons which keep us apart—the reasons I mean distinct from personal considerations. Many younger Positivists have from time to time, under a benevolent impulse, and without any competence for judgment, urged a reunion. The time is come then to explain to all Positivists why I hold such reunion—any fusion—to be more distant than they imagine, and entirely undesirable under our present conditions. I will keep as clear as I can of all personal questions.

The explanation is forced on me by what is occurring in our own body, and by the language used or reported to be used at Newton Hall

on the first of the current year. I do not dwell on the North London centre; it is, I hear, very successful; but in the remarks which follow I need not introduce it. I speak of Newton Hall as it appears to the outside observer through its most accredited representative or representatives.

Politically we differ and on grave points.

I will but mention here our divergence on the Channel Tunnel as I have drawn attention to it in a separate publication. On another point which relates to France I do not think we can disagree too strongly with the language held at Newton Hall. The eulogy on Gambetta is what I allude to. That statesman, whose ability I have no wish to question any more than certain eminent merits, has left his country a most fatal inheritance, altogether alien to the conception of her true policy. He has left her a misdirected colonial policy—a fundamentally mistaken foreign policy, as a Positivist must judge it. By his terse recommendation he has succeeded in throwing doubt on all her peaceful professions; he has done what he could to write revenge on all the action of his country. For the rest, one expression judges him for any true Positivist. A man whose religion was France is condemned in our eyes by the very force of the terms. Whether it was so or was not is no business of mine. But we cannot impute it to him, and at the same time welcome him into our ranks or claim him as a supporter.

Again we differ on Ireland. To this also I have already drawn attention in a note to my Annual Address. We as Positivists have no feeling in favour of Imperial Union. We should not in my judgment accept—we may have to acquiesce in—Home Rule. Moreover, so far as I follow the policy hitherto advocated at Newton Hall, I think it tends not merely to an erroneous course on the special question of the day, but also to making us dependent on the conclusions of the statesman, no matter of which party, so attaching what is essentially a spiritual movement to the temporal Power, compromising our just independence.

Again, and in the same direction, there is divergence on another point. If there be a question more important in the sociological order than any other it is that of the separation of the temporal and spiritual Powers. The reciprocal independence of the two is of the utmost urgency. And the difficulty at the present day, as it has been since the fourteenth century, is to secure the due freedom of the Spiritual. Whatever contributes to the confusion of the two is to be eschewed by Positivists. It seems to me that for two of the leading *teachers* in a Positivist group to be candidates for a seat in Parliament is a palpable disregard of this truth, with the inconvenience which at once follows that the moral influence must be subordinated to the political. I hold firmly to the desirability of our standing aloof from actual political life at our present stage, most especially if we are engaged as we most of us are in influencing, by word or writing, opinion. This is our true function and for its discharge impartiality is imperative.

Further, in more directly religious matters I see a great difference between us. Take the case of the Sacraments,—in the religion of Humanity, as in the Christian Church, so vital a point. The marriage, so called, celebrated at Newton Hall last year in no way conformed to the conditions laid down for that Sacrament by Auguste Comte. Those conditions are very definite, and not lightly to be put aside. They correspond to well-defined duties, and have very positive ends in view. There is first a promise of a three months' period of chastity, a promise given a month before the civil marriage. Then comes the civil marriage,

and not till three months later the religious or Positivist marriage, of which the essential feature is the engagement of eternal widowhood as condensing the Positivist conception of the married relation. All these clearly-stated conditions are made to fade away into vague feelings—for accepted duties we have hopes, for obligations imposed we have recommendations. The excuse for this weak and arbitrary rendering of the great Sacrament is the absence of the Sacerdotal character, of the priestly power to impose duties. Then why assume the function? For there is no function without an organ, and those who assume functions should rise for the occasion to be organs. And the more conscious they are of their imperfection as organs the more strictly should they subordinate themselves to the directions left by their Master. I cannot reconcile the withdrawal from the requirement of obligations with the power assumed to modify all the prescriptions.

But it is in this case as in all other cases of like difficulty. And difficulties necessarily wait on beginnings. It seems we are to adjourn any normal action till times are favourable—wait, in fact, till the difficulty has ceased. How it is to cease unless a beginning is made remains a question. In the case of marriage the course actually pursued is the more inexcusable, as in Paris, in Comte's lifetime and since, there have been Positivist marriages, and in England there have been five or six cases of marriage in obedience to the indications given us in the *Positive Politics*. So that the course taken at Newton Hall is a distinct retrogression from a position which has been already held, and which might the more easily therefore have been maintained.

In close connection with this arbitrary treatment of a particular institution is, so far as I can learn, the general attitude of Newton Hall towards Auguste Comte, whose higher teachings are really suppressed as unsuited to our time; that is, the great construction of the new Church is submitted to the judgment of a revolutionary age, and in the interest of immediate success. As exemplifying my meaning, the Catechism is avoided as the basis of the teaching given, and the latest and greatest of Comte's volumes is as much ignored as possible. I can but give my impression of the spirit which characterises the presentment of Positivism at Newton Hall; the impression on which I act when I reject the idea of fusion. I look upon it as a revolt from Auguste Comte, analogous to, and not less injurious to the new Religion than, that of Littré.

Their whole method of procedure, I speak of what appears, is to me objectionable. It is predominantly literary.* It appeals to the Public, and by all the common means, especially through the periodical press, newspaper or magazine, whilst Auguste Comte so emphatically and so wisely recommends his followers to eschew journalism. It is moreover a method of concession, of compromise, a lowering of the great cause; a cheapening of the Religion I have heard it happily styled. It is combative, discussive, popular, and as all this it is illogical. For a religion is not to be spread by means which it must disclaim when it is established.

I speak of the direction imprinted on the whole movement; quite recognising that there are in the body which accepts it and serves it with zeal very valuable elements which time and thought and the teaching of events will mature and guide aright. I wish to say no more than is

* See in the *Positive Politics* (Vol. IV., p. 471, E. Tr.) Auguste Comte's strong objection to a literary direction.

necessary to make it clear how great is our divergence. And the utterance is drawn from me by the affirmation that no such divergence exists.

Moreover, were a fusion of less difficulty than it is in England, were there, that is, much less substantial reasons for disagreement, it would be impossible from the relation which subsists or subsisted till very lately between M. Laffitte and the Newton Hall direction. I may here say that the strength of the latter as against me has lain in the original misstatement (which two years ago I saw formally repeated in a newspaper by one of the English group) that M. Laffitte was named as his successor by Auguste Comte and that consequently in leaving his direction I broke with a formal appointment of our Founder. The translation of the *Will* enables all to judge this misstatement, and has impaired M. Laffitte's position as so put forward. But be this as it may, so far as appears, Newton Hall is still under his nominal direction. That direction deviates more and more from the true path on all political questions, and in its general spirit, apart from such questions, is increasingly at variance with his Master. So at least I judge it in accordance with others. Yet hitherto at any rate all M. Laffitte's pretensions have been upheld by his partisans here, and his statement of facts as regards English Positivism, which I can hardly characterise as other than mendacious, is not or has not been discountenanced by them. What purpose such a statement serves except to manifest his hostility I do not know. Neither in Paris nor England is it of any use to try and conceal the existence, in England or elsewhere, of other Positivist movements than those in connection with himself. This however would be a small point were the direction of M. Laffitte such as the West requires. It is so little so that it constitutes a serious obstacle to our advance, and the responsibility of upholding it must rest on its English supporters.

Let me not be misunderstood. Now, as ever, were it necessary, I would do what I could to secure M. Laffitte's material position. That is quite a different thing from acquiescing in the incubus of his direction. It would be a step towards peace if he lowered his claims—desisted from his policy of excommunication, and discouraged rather than encouraged hostility. This by the way. In any case a fusion is not practicable between two bodies, one of which clings to his direction, whilst the other feels that for all guidance it must look exclusively to Auguste Comte.

In submission to Auguste Comte we accept the task of proclaiming a new religion—of advocating the new and potent religious change which is the outcome of the Past, the service of the Future. To us, however we may fall short, this is the one sole issue. We would not speak hesitatingly as to what we offer being a religion. It is that, with all its consequences of stringent discipline, a great mental and moral renovation—a social renovation dependent on a mental and moral renovation—and as such effected through the regeneration of the individual. We accept this task in full knowledge of what it brings with it. In sad truth we deny ourselves much. We go to meet failure as it were. We have to stand the test of great isolation. We place before a revolutionary environment a conception for which it has no wish as it runs counter to its intellectual disorder, its early training, its Protestant indiscipline, its national egoism, its straining after empire. We must stand comparatively alone.

We have no choice on this point. A religion is not to be put forward in any way, no matter what. It is not a matter of compromise. All experience is in favour of its full logical statement. All experience also is in favour of our full obedience to a great Constructor.

To be more bent on carrying out the doctrine to its just results—more bent on seeing what it means—on putting it in practice—on drawing it out in its consequences than on examining its foundations or on making it palatable or immediately successful—this is the method I think preferable, and by which with few or many I am prepared to abide. But then this is not the method of Newton Hall, or I misjudge it greatly.

Practically what we have to do is to hold on in the course we have chosen—to let our belief tell on ourselves first—try our methods for ourselves without any concession; strengthen ourselves rather in them, and so test them. There is in such a conduct no fear of what others may do—no reason for hostility, but there is no reason for fusion.

Standing on our own ground we can wait for others to advance towards it. I regret we are not all together; but, I speak for many: we cannot compromise to secure our being all together. I would urge on those who are with me in the spirit of what I have said—they will make allowance for any defects of expression—this temperate interpretation of our common position. I need not urge on them firmness in asserting it.

I have touched on many delicate points in this circular. I have touched on them shortly in order to keep within the limits of such a document, but freely, for it is addressed to Positivists. Were our history as well known as it should be, what I have said would be superfluous. Gradually it will become known and the action of all of us understood and judged.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

Born at Leamington Hastings, Warwickshire,
September 4th, 1818.

55, Palace Gardens Terrace, W.
26 Homer, 100.
(23rd February, 1888.)

N.B.—Begun on Jan. 15th, this Circular has been delayed by indisposition.

I GIVE THE TWO LISTS OF
THE EXECUTORS OF AUGUSTE COMTE,
which may be of interest to many.

I.—ORIGINAL LIST.
MM. AUDIFFRENT.
DE CAPELLEN.
LE BARON W. DE CONSTANT
REBECQUE.
DEULLIN.
DON JOSÉ FLOREZ.
DR. EDOUARD FOLEY.
HADÉRY.
LAFFITTE.
LONCHAMPT.
MAGNIN.
PAPOT.
DR. ROBINET.
COUNT STIRUM.

II.—LIST AS IT NOW
STANDS.
MM. AUDIFFRENT.
BRIDGES.
CONGREVE.
DELBET.
DEULLIN.
FILI.
FLOREZ.
FOLEY.
FOUCART.
HUTTON.
LAFFITTE.
LONCHAMPT.
ROBINET.

(I.)—*The Sacerdotal Fund.*

Balance from previous years £316 13 2

(II.)—*Subscriptions for the Year 99 (1887.)*

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Occidental 115	Minimum	0	1	0	316	12
	Mean	2	15	0½		
	Maximum	50	0	0		
Oriental ... 18	Minimum	0	4	6	17	8
	Mean	0	19	1½		
	Maximum	4	10	0		
Total... 133				334	0	9
Final Payment from Birmingham				0	19	0
				£334	19	9

(III.)—*Expenses for the Year 99 (1887.)*

London Room :—	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Rent	55	0	0	111	6	3
Gas and Firing	3	7	9			
Wages	26	17	4			
Various Items	5	12	9			
Social Meetings	1	19	2			
Organ	12	0	0			
Cloth for Altar Steps	3	0	0			
Library	3	9	3			
Contribution to Newcastle Church.....	90	0	0			
Two Quarters' Rent for Room	15	0	0			
Mr. Quin	40	0	0	172	0	0
Dr. Lagarrigue	21	0	0			
Leicester Room	6	0	0	30	0	0
Administration						
Total Expenses.....	313	6	3	£334	19	9
Balance.....	21	13	6			

(IV.)—Amount for the year	£	s.	d.
90 (1878)	156	13	0
" " " 91 (1879)	260	0	0
" " " 92 (1880)	325	19	6
" " " 93 (1881)	283	16	11
" " " 94 (1882)	264	19	4
" " " 95 (1883)	320	12	6
" " " 96 (1884)	319	2	7
" " " 97 (1885)	302	15	10
" " " 98 (1886)	322	10	0
" " " 99 (1887)	330	15	9

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

LIVE FOR OTHERS.

LOVE FOR PRINCIPLE
AND ORDER FOR BASIS;
PROGRESS FOR END.

LIVE OPENLY.

ELEVENTH ANNUAL CIRCULAR

ADDRESSED TO EVERY SUBSCRIBER TO THE VOLUN-
TARY FUND INSTITUTED BY AUGUSTE COMTE ON
BEHALF OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF HUMANITY.

London, 22 Moses 101 (22 January, 1889).

The formation of the Positivist Priesthood is become the first condition of a renovation which is as imperatively demanded by order as by progress. Positivists at the outset had to ascend from faith to love, but henceforward they should give the preference to the more rapid and more effective method which leads downward from love to faith.

AUGUSTE COMTE.

SIR,—

The financial statement at the end of this circular shows that whilst the number of subscribers remains about the same, the total amount of the subscription is smaller. The fund is a very important point in our action. Though it meets our immediate wants it is a great object to increase it gradually and to enlarge its basis. I do not urge on any one to raise his or her subscription, but in general terms I repeat what I have said before, that the subscription should be a deliberate act, it should be regular and fixed in point of time, needing no reminder, an act performed as a duty, our religion being a religion of duties. No demand is ever made in Chapel Street in connection with our movement, not even an indirect demand, all is left to the responsibility of each as to the aid given to the cause. At however early an age, assistance, if given spontaneously and as a sign of interest, is welcomed, and is useful and beneficial to those who give it. After the receipt of the Sacrament of Initiation it appears to me desirable that the adolescent should give some assistance as such sign, whenever, that is, there is the ability. And again when there is the ability a gradual advance in the amount given as the years advance would be a right effort. The natural application of any surplus will be to the printing fund, more especially to meet the expenses of publication of Auguste Comte's works, whether letters

or translations. His letters to Mr. Fisher are in the press. The translation of the *Appel aux vrais Conservateurs* will be so shortly, and a translation of the Introduction to the *Synthèse Subjective* is preparing.

For this year the employment of the fund is sufficiently explained by the financial statement—there has been no extraordinary demand on it. Such aid as I thought it desirable to give to Dr. Jorge Lagarrigue (£20) to enable him to meet the expenses of his pamphlet, *La Dictature Républicaine*, was taken from the Printing Fund. The substantive part of that work, as distinct from certain accessories, seemed to me to have a value which justified such aid, as being entirely in accordance with the teaching of our Master, a seasonable reassertion of the position he took; and the contribution I sent was limited to that specific object.

The crisis, Auguste Comte has said, should be dictatorial and not parliamentary. The disciple who exerts himself in Paris to fix attention on this point, and with that view expounds with clearness and competence the teachings of our common Master, should, I thought, not be left to bear alone the heavy pressure, which, under his circumstances, his writing involved. In reference to the pamphlet itself, the statement of the whole question must gain in force and reality if attached to a particular person. The choice made was determined by the actual political situation. It could be no other than General Boulanger. But this choice by no means implied any judgment as to the special qualifications of the General for the task which some one is wanted to accomplish. The estimate of any given statesman must be very uncertain previous to trial, and his complete subsequent failure does not invalidate the use made of his name when it is necessary to give fixity to an idea. Its use is equivalent, in fact, to the expression of a hope, and carries with it advice both to the person most nearly concerned and to his fellow citizens, as to the opinion on which they should act. So I understand the pamphlet, and on the ground of its general utility I helped to meet its cost.

Dr. Lagarrigue has been since supported by a pamphlet from Dr. Audiffrent, under the title, '*Dictature, Parlementarisme*,' with a less special application, but coinciding completely in the general conclusions. It is a pleasure to notice the agreement and the combination of effort, and Dr. Audiffrent's high intellectual competence, in conjunction with his thorough mastery of the Positive doctrine, gives to his support a value which none can dispute.

From the printing fund I have also sent £10 to Mr. Lemos to help him in the publication of the Portuguese translation of the Positivist Catechism. This will commend itself to all our co-religionists as a desirable employment of the fund. The work written by Auguste Comte with the special purpose of propagating the Religion of Humanity must be made as accessible as possible, so as to overcome the obstacle of diversity of language, which so greatly hampers all our endeavours after union.

During the year we have lost two veteran Postivists—Mr. H. Edger and Mr. Barton. Mr. Edger was a direct and highly valued disciple of Auguste Comte, their correspondence dating from the early months of the year 66 (1854). The connection is more than once noticed in the Circulars. In the Seventh Circular (p. 70, E. Tr.) there is mention of the conferring, by delegation, of the Sacrament of Presentation in the nascent American Church. In the Eighth (pp. 81, 82), there is very high praise given to the work on the Calendar published in 1856, as one in which, 'under too modest a title, the Positive religion received

its best actual appreciation by the eminent founder of our American Church.'

In regard to that movement, as to so many others, there have not been the persistence and the continuity which could have been wished, but there remain yet some fruits of it,—the seed sown has not been altogether wasted. Difficulties of one kind or another beset Mr. Edger, and he sought, to my regret and to his own regret subsequently, as he told me in a letter, a possibly more congenial sphere in Europe. But his existence there was a troubled one. In the discussions which have agitated the Positivist body he differed with me as to the ultimate conclusion, scarcely as to the reasons which supported it, but such difference does not alter the fact that throughout he held firmly to his faith and laboured in his own way for its propagation. I may quote the just tribute of an eminent French co-religionist, 'What an ardent faith! nothing disturbed it, neither privations, nor travels, nor old age.' In such persistence we can see the strength which the new Religion can give its disciples under the most unsatisfying external circumstances.

Full of years—he was within two months of eighty-eight—Mr. Barton has passed away, in the enjoyment of all his faculties, though with much suffering. His was a remarkable case, in so far that he accepted the Religion of Humanity when he was nearly sixty. At that advanced age he found it answer very largely to the wants of his intellectual and moral nature, and he set himself to preach it actively to others. When he could no longer continue this exertion he lost no opportunity of putting it before others so far as his quiet and retired life gave him such opportunities. The Religion was his constant study, his support and comfort, and he watched all that concerned it with the keenest interest. Again, in his case we have the spectacle of persistence and unhesitating faith in all the leading doctrines of our Religion.

Naturally, the late period of life at which he adopted it left him with much of his earlier bias and associations clinging to him, and colouring the mode of his regarding the Religion, affecting also the degree of acceptance he gave. An expression of the excellent Baron de Constant-Rebecque recurs to my memory:—'I am,' he said, 'Positivist as far as I can be.' It quite applies to Mr. Barton. Such reserves as he had never interfered with his devotion to the cause. His simple, peaceful, honourable existence, in complete conformity with his opinions, and, I may add, under varying circumstances always consistent in its uprightness and firm moral judgment, leaves us by that devotion, and by his persistence, another encouraging example by which all may profit.

A third death has touched us all very closely—that of Mr. Frey. Others have spoken of him, but I may not therefore omit a brief notice of him. His personality and character had endeared him to all. His acceptance and interpretation of the Positivist system diverged, and were of a different character, from that which we would give to our own. In much we could not but disagree. An expression used at his funeral meets the case. It was then said that the large assemblage of mourners of widely different opinions which met at his grave had one common bond with one another and with Mr. Frey in the faith which he held so strongly and which they shared—the Faith in Humanity. Mr. Frey believed in the *Religion of Humanity*, but it was in the most general sense. This central point of union granted, all else was rather uncertain. It is necessary to be clear on this point. I cannot think that in any sense he held Positivism as it exists in the conception of Auguste Comte. Only in the vaguest way could he be called a Positivist. Apart from this, however, the fact remains that, whatever his speculative

belief, his pure, unselfish and very noble life, the gentleness and affectionateness of his nature, bound all to him; that without any question all equally can admire his devotion to the cause as he understood it, his unreserved acceptance of the duties of the apostolate sacramentally conferred upon him, and which he sought under the impulse of his loving regard for his own nation.

To impart to his fellow countrymen, the troubled Russian nation, the central truth which he so highly valued himself, was the object of his life, his ruling thought in death. Not able from illness to be present at his funeral and take the part I had been requested to take, I must not refrain from expressing my pleasure that over his grave all distinctions were for the time forgotten, and that in the common human tribute to a beautiful nature all Positivists joined without any sense of jar.

Lastly we have to deplore the loss of one of our Indian co-religionists, Mr. Dinu Nath Chatterjea. His death, at the age of sixty, occurred just at the close of the year. He had been connected with the educational department, and in his retirement lent his valuable support to the service of the Religion of Humanity. We would express our sympathy with his personal friends and our regret that a fellow-labourer has been taken from our side. Every Indian adhesion has so real a value.

In my last circular I spoke of the differences between Positivists. What I then said was drawn from me by a statement that we were all agreed. It seemed desirable that on such a point there should be no misunderstanding, that the real position of affairs should be clearly explained. In general I do not think it can be denied that my explanation was moderate in form. But some whose approval and affection I set store by, disapprove of one part of it, the expression I use in speaking of Mr. Laffitte's circulars. It is a serious fault to use strong language when milder will do, in any degree, that is, to increase irritation. This I fully acknowledge and therefore avow my regret for the use of the term in question, and my wish that I had chosen a less obnoxious form to express my objection to a particular line of conduct. I offer this apology both to friends and opponents.

Returning to my explanation of our differences, it is important to see facts as they are, and so to be clear as to our action. But, when once they have been stated, we need not go back on the subject, but rather seek for the future to avoid all contest, abandon all negative attitude, and promote as much as we can peaceful and friendly relations. I have never seen why we could not differ on really grave public issues without unfriendliness. I reserve, naturally, personal complications, which will ever be a source of difficulty—differences, I mean, of character or temperament. But apart from these, the penetrating force of which we all feel, disagreement as to the direction to be taken should not have brought with it so much hostility as there has been. As in my original circular, so in this present one, I say that the sense of positivist fraternity ought to continue in the midst of all divergence or reciprocal disapproval of the conclusions severally reached, and whenever we can we ought to work towards its establishment. I write this because I think it has been supposed that I wished to discourage friendly relations with Positivists who do not act with me. This was far from my intention. I wish earnestly for a more peaceful state of things, more especially for the generation which is to take our place, and which I trust will have an easier time in regard to the propagation as well as the practice of our religion than we of the first generation have had. It has been, it will, I am afraid, still be, very hard to see what was the best course to

take under our circumstances. The mistakes made will be allowed for, whoever may have made them, when the full difficulty of the task undertaken, and the circumstances of our spiritually orphaned, unguided, condition after the death of Auguste Comte, receive their due consideration. It is much that, with such a condition, we have persisted, and so far succeeded as to gain from our best opponents in England the large amount of recognition which we evidently have gained.

The several Positivist centres with which I am in friendly connection have all continued their work through the past year with as little interruption as possible. So also it has been in Chapel Street, by virtue of the efforts of others in this case, for which efforts I am most grateful. There has also been, when required, the administration of the social sacraments, together with the use of such supplementary institutions as in our early condition tend to foster the feeling of union in a church, by a distinct avowal of their adhesion on the part of its members, and by a distinct recognition of the acceptance by the Church of such avowal—the consecration of their membership.

Each centre has its own peculiar interest and difficulties. I begin with the most distant. There has been in Calcutta no marked change; no decrease in numbers; no diminution of effort. It has given us from the pen of our leading Hindu Positivist, Babu Jogendra Chandra Ghosh, a remarkable contribution.

In my discourse on the sacrament of *Incorporation*—the Incorporation of Mr. Geddes, I alluded more than once to this contribution, which bears the title, *Brahman the Priest*. I would here single out for notice two points in it. The first is of the greater interest to us, from its showing how, under widely different circumstances, there lies an essential similarity of requirement for the eastern and western worlds.

In Western Europe we are accustomed to look upon the formation of a new Spiritual Power as the first condition of a renovation which is imperatively demanded. There comes to us in this pamphlet from the East a recognition of the same want, and an indication of the means of supplying that want by the restoration in full of the Brahman caste—the Spiritual Power in India consecrated by long tradition. This revival of the priestly functions of the Brahman on the basis of a sound adaptation to the changes wrought by time, would place the spiritual guidance of India in the right hands. The direction given by such a priesthood would counteract the disturbing influences of our troublesome Western education and anarchical literature which have been forced on the native mind and which tend to pervert all their notions. I would suggest to all Indian Positivists whether it were not the wiser course to keep themselves as clear as they can from both influences, and more particularly to turn with the most rigid self-control from the chaos of Western opinion, its endless and profitless discussions, whilst remaining steadfastly true to the central idea of Humanity they concentrate themselves on their own national traditions and on the great question in what way the new order can most wisely be evoked from the older and pre-existent religion.

So far for the first point. The second point to which I would direct attention is the well considered, well founded, most seasonable and most Positivist judgment of Buddha and Buddhism. There is a considerable amount of vague sentiment gathered or gathered around Buddhism in the West, harmonising with the vaguer and more inorganic Christianity which is popular, as also with many other tendencies of the day. We may welcome, then, with satisfaction the author's moderate yet firm blame of Buddha's action in deserting the position to which he was born and substituting new social obligations for those which he had inherited.

Such a judgment helps in justifying, if justification is needed, the Brahminical rejection of the Buddhist reform as a revolutionary movement an alien intrusion, without sufficient warrant, on their traditional organisation. From both points of view we are equally brought back to the true direction of our Indian effort as relating properly to the indigenous social and religious order.

In Liverpool, where there is so much energy and sustained effort, such real social feeling, there has been the difficulty in the direction of such effort due to the indisposition of Dr. Carson, who presides over that movement. At our early stage of existence what is most needed is the quiet continuance of our exertions rather than any striking activity, and it is precisely such quiet continuance which, from one cause or another, we have found it in all cases so hard to secure. That so important a branch of the rising Church may surmount, by submission and fraternity, any passing embarrassments, must be the earnest wish of all.

I had hoped that with this year there would have been a resumption of combined action in Birmingham. An effort was made but it has not succeeded. It testified, however, in its failure to the continued existence of the elements of a Positivist centre, as well as to the sense of the desirability of combination. The failure shows that we must wait till a stronger impulse leads the Birmingham Positivists to form a community. In the meantime what has been done previously need not be lost, for each single Positivist may be a centre of influence and may work on towards the formation of a better state of things.

In Newcastle there has been no interruption of our movement. By its possession of a church the small Positivist body there stands on a firm base. It has a home of its own, and can wait with calm for the gradual advance of our doctrine—an advance which is perceptible in many directions, and which will make itself felt in Newcastle as elsewhere. It has not been an easy matter to secure this establishment, but gradually the obstacles have been removed to the satisfaction of Mr. Quin and those who work with him in prudent and harmonious co-operation; they, as all of us, are sowing the seed for a future more or less near.

Our last social and religious centre in England is Leicester. The year has been a burdensome one owing to matters wholly unconnected with Positivism, but the close union in thought and feeling that exists in Leicester supports and carries on their action, and its wholesome influence is felt beyond its own immediate limits.

I reserve for the close of the circular the whole question of Chapel Street. Of the other two London bodies, Newton Hall and the North London Society, I need only say that they continue as far as I know to be very successful, nor have I any reason to doubt that the same may be said of the Manchester Positivists.

Turning from England to other countries the publications of the year are an evidence that in South America there has been a steady continuance of former efforts. This is shown as to Chili by Mr. Juan Enrique Lagarrigue, who has published an address to an eminent Spanish writer—a Spaniard of the mother country. The object of the pamphlet is to connect the colony with that mother country and stimulate both to a wise adoption of the new faith. The writer thus avails himself of a natural opening for present agreement and future progress. I offer no criticism, but content myself with indicating the positive aspect of the letter—that in which we are agreed, leaving out of sight any points there may be of disagreement.

Again for Brazil the last report of M. Lemos records the activity

without intermission of our Brazilian co-religionists. The state of their country, both temporally and spiritually, seems favourable to such activity. It is a special pleasure to congratulate them on the final step as to slavery, its complete abolition in Brazil, for which they have worked so long and so steadily. Now that this great change has been effected, we may hope that their noble exertions on behalf of the aboriginal population may in due time meet with equal success. Such public satisfactions are needed as some compensation for the losses of private life. I allude more especially to the suffering borne by the whole Brazilian body in consequence of the death of Madame Cordeiro, the young and noble-minded lady who died in Paris last year, and to whose memory we would offer our most respectful homage. In deepest sorrow her husband has returned to Brazil with his children, as after the loss of their mother they could not elsewhere have the desired surroundings. To him, too, on behalf of all, I may offer, as I have done personally, a tribute of affection and sympathy.

Few have more reason to regret this loss than Dr. Lagarrigue in Paris, as it takes from him one of the alleviations of his arduous task, a task so arduous as to need every possible alleviation. It would seem, however, that there are indications of progress in various ways, that, however slowly, support is gathering round him to sustain his courage and patience, bringing him nearer to the attainment of his special object—the foundation in Paris of an avowedly and in its outward form religious movement, in which the Religion of Humanity shall take its due pre-eminence. It is in furtherance of this object that by special applications he calls attention to the power the Religion has to deal with the difficult social problems as they arise, a labour in which he, as before said, receives the aid of Dr. Audiffrent. Their combined general direction I consider, as I have already hinted, to be right both in the temporal and spiritual order; as also in regard to the relations between the two. In conformity with the teaching of our Master and with all the tendencies of historical French policy, they are right in urging the need for the time of a strongly concentrated power vested in one man, a provisional dictatorship in fact. In the relations between the temporal and spiritual, they are right in insisting on the complete independence of both in their respective spheres, and on the measures which are necessary to constitute such independence. And that which is claimed for ourselves is claimed also for others—for every form of Christian belief, and particularly, in the case of France, for the Roman Catholic Church. They would restore complete freedom to its action by severing its connection with the State. On the purely spiritual direction I have already spoken.

Now, as always, it remains a cardinal object of our effort to promote union with France. The solid foundation of such union can only be in the West, as in Medieval Christendom, a community of religion; and therefore it is that we watch with such anxious expectation every step taken to imprint upon French Positivism its true religious character. During the slow advance towards this end, we anxiously await and wish for such European action on the part of France as may allay, so far as she is in question, the existing disquietude, and render easier that concert between France and England, which in the interests of the orderly settlement of the West is so desirable. So much may be said without entering at length on considerations which cannot be fully discussed within the limits of the present circular.

There are many other points of interest suggested by the past year, or by the various social and political movements of our time; I can but

briefly touch upon some of them. The temperate and respectful debates or papers of the Church congress, if they led to no definite result, clearly indicated both the progress we have made and the extent of our indirect influence. And it is in such indirect influence that for the immediate future will lie our chief importance, resting as it must do, if it is to be sound, on our own internal advance—our personal, and family, and Church progress. Nothing in the meantime can be more satisfactory than the general tone adopted towards us, especially when we compare it with that which was usual during the early years of the present generation—the years of our commencing effort.

Whilst we recognise without hesitation or reserve the initiative of France, and feel to what an extent we are dependent on her, as are the other states of Europe, for a wise use of that initiative; whilst we also feel that until France rise to such use, the whole Leadership of the West is maimed or rendered noxious; we yet see clearly that in each of her compeers and in our own country not less than others, the problems to be solved, the difficulties to be overcome, are in many cases essentially the same. So it is, that guided by the light of our doctrine, we can, in the absence of the afore-mentioned initiative, work towards the solution of such problems. Nowhere is this the case more than in England, for nowhere, as a consequence of its Protestant antecedents, has the confusion of the two powers so prevailed. And all recent legislation has tended to increase that confusion—to give it deeper roots in all our social and political life. Sufficient if we instance the unwholesome intrusion of the State into the province of education, and secondly, the constant development of legislative action in regard to questions which are not properly within the domain of such action, but to be treated exclusively by moral and spiritual agencies. On such points we can, and ought to, seek to direct opinion to sounder conclusions, labouring steadily for the complete separation of the two powers. It is in this connection that we see the necessity for those who would thus influence opinion to maintain a position of thorough impartiality—to resist all temptations to mix themselves in the movement they would control.

On larger international issues, again, I can only touch most briefly, selecting, in fact, one for notice, the interference of Europe with Africa. This interference is of very long standing. In modern times even, we have to go back centuries for its commencement. In our own times, quite recently, it is assuming larger proportions and a more systematic character. On all fitting occasions we have to deprecate this change; we have to urge on our countrymen the duty we owe to that oppressed continent; the obligation which rests on us, by virtue of our participation in the oppression, to revise our whole action in regard to Africa; and, above all, to be most circumspect as to any common action with any other powers which may interfere with such revision. It cannot be for the true interest either of England or Europe.

The last special point I have to treat is the change which has been made in the direction of Chapel Street. After the early months of last year I found myself unable to continue what I had been doing, and at the end of the year I had to reconsider the whole position. I came to the conclusion that age and health combined made it necessary to diminish my work. I have therefore given up all the regular Sunday work, which I found too much for me, and have resigned the direction of the whole Chapel Street action into the hands of Mr. Henry Crompton, aided by Mr. Sulman. They will conduct the movement on their own full responsibility. To their discretion it is committed. On all the details of its conduct their judgment will be quite free, whilst a

certain general direction is vested in me. The relation in which I stand henceforward to Chapel Street, if closer and more intimate as a consequence of a long connection and also of our practical conditions, is in principle somewhat of the same kind as that in which I stand to any other centre—say Newcastle—which acknowledges my direction. Whatever help I can give from time to time I shall be glad to give; and I shall, so long as I am able, administer the Sacraments and write the Annual Address. I do so with the assent and expressed wish of the Direction. I retain also the management of the Sacerdotal Fund, and with it am bound by the obligation to explain its employment in an annual circular. Such is the arrangement which has been agreed upon in the most cordial and pleasant spirit.

I shall shrink from no work to which I am still competent, but it must be less active, less regular work than hitherto. There is in many directions much to be done if I have life and health in sufficient measure. In general I may say that I take only such a measure of direction as is accorded me. I accept all other relations. Recognised by Auguste Comte as by the force of circumstances invested with the presidency of English Positivism, whilst never putting forward the claim founded on his recognition, I have never been unmindful of my Master's acknowledgment, and have sought to fulfil its obligations so far as I was able. I shall persist in the same course.

With reference to the past management, I may say that the effort has been very difficult. To decide on the best way of putting before the world a new religion is a very hard matter. The mistakes made may have been numerous, the general method not the best. A first solution of any problem is necessary, however, and useful, if imperfect. In the method I have adopted, I have been guided by the experience of our religious Past in England, and have sought in *continuity* with that Past the surest safeguard. Such changes as my successors feel advisable they will introduce. In their zeal and faithfulness to the cause, in their complete agreement in the aim of former action, viz., the establishment of a church, I have the fullest confidence; for the aid so generously given me hitherto I am deeply grateful, as I am grateful also to them for undertaking the very arduous task of continuing the work.

All who are agreed upon the supreme importance of the religious aspect of Positivism, on the duty of so presenting it, will feel the need of drawing together as closely as our circumstances will allow. The temptations to swerve from such a course are numerous; above all stands out prominently the temptation of immediate results, of success, which in every province of life is carrying men away. Setting this temptation at naught, as under a strong conviction and a well-reasoned understanding of what is requisite for a new Religion we ought to set it at naught, all can help the new direction under its arduous task. Each can do much. The value of single personal effort is nowhere more recognised than in Positivism; and each one who gives hearty and regular support, makes it easier for others to do the same.

So far for the more particular questions connected with the centre in Chapel Street. More generally, I may remark that it has always, during its nearly twenty years of existence, had a representative character. It has represented the religious presentation of the Faith of Humanity. It has by virtue of its past a strongly characterised value, to which, in this generation, we are hardly awake. Its small congregation does not stand for itself alone, but for all who in England, or elsewhere in connection with our English movement, share its conviction that it is emphatically a Religion which we are propagating—a Church of which

we are laying the foundations. The two terms imply much. In the first and highest place they imply the moral discipline and religious discipline which require and rest on the culture of our best feelings, together with the revival of the habits which promote such culture.

Though few in number and apparently unsuccessful, we hold on our way in anticipation of a favourable verdict in the end. Our religion, if it is anything, is the one hope of mankind: the one sole guarantee of man's peaceful advance; its interest therefore transcends every other. The consciousness of this its greatness should penetrate us, and influence all our methods, deepen all our feelings. Our cause is alien to all gloom, to all insincerity, but at the same time our claim must not be understated or in any way lowered. It brings with it the task of moving entirely from the old on to the new platform—of gradually rising to a new level—of reshaping, that is, all our conceptions and objects. A religious change of so thorough a kind should, with each year of life, become more accepted and more sacred, though we never forget the entirely human character which attaches to it—its distinctness from, as well as its continuity with, all the religions which have worked towards it, and which find their completion in it.

In the discharge of our duty, so conceived, we take as our guide the teachings of Auguste Comte in their integrity. It is a constructive work in which we are engaged, and we rest on the guidance of the master mind which has left us the outline of the construction. It is the imperious need of the time that we be found faithful to him. We need enter into no nice distinctions, or state any abstract propositions as to the limits of our faithfulness. Practically the decision on the details of the fabric rests with the author of the design; and enough has been left us for the present, if used with reverence and submission.

So, again, in obedience to his indication, when we seek to influence opinion outside, it is not by general expositions of the doctrine that we proceed, but by its application to the larger questions as they arise, directing attention more particularly, as he counselled, on the largest of all as the easiest, on the international relations therefore of the various constituents of the race. The treatment of such questions naturally diverts us from all narrow nationalism. And its influence extends farther, to the exclusion, that is, of undue rivalry with others in regard to our service in the common cause. I need not dwell on the personal moral effort which this involves, the sifting of our whole mental and moral being. For it requires an effort to sacrifice national prejudices and impulses; yet the old language is applicable to all Positivists: *in honour preferring one another*. To be a link in the chain of Positivist Brotherhoods; accepting all advances where no compromise of principle is involved; recognising the just claims of each—is not this the true aim? The whole forming that which has been more than once mentioned—a society—a church with unity of doctrine and growing unity of practice.

I am confident that, allowing for the imperfections of statement, I am describing aright the aim and character of the direction of Chapel Street—free from all opportunist, revolutionary, and lastly, literary tendencies. In the present disorder and consequent uncertainty both of opinion and action, no numerical weakness can deprive such a centre of influence—of value as a rallying point.

I turn once more for a moment to European considerations, and to the central nation more especially, to France as the real leader of Europe in the Past, as its real leader in the Present by virtue of Auguste Comte's creation of the Religion of Humanity—a perfectly indefeasible claim, which no passing weakness or trouble can abrogate.

The anxieties which surround her present state have a strongly disturbing effect. For us here in England, for the present, the consciousness of less immediate disorder and danger renders a dispassionate calm more possible. How long it may continue so is uncertain. But no such advantage, temporary or permanent, impairs our obligation to help by due honour and sympathy towards the establishment of right relations with France,—as the nation whose prolonged suffering is strictly vicarious. For it must not be forgotten that if we avoid violent revolution, if the other nations of the West avoid violent revolution, it will be because France will have borne the stress of such revolution for us and them. In constant memory of this and her other services, we do what in us lies in furtherance of union with France, whilst we express our hope and wish that she may see that her true greatness does not depend on military power or territorial extent, but on her acceptance of the spiritual leadership of the Western world, and therefore of the whole Race.

In strictest connection with the foregoing, I add that the year on which we are entering is highly suggestive. It is the first year of the second Positivist generation—in the usual sense of the word generation—as a period of thirty-three years. The first extended from 1855 to 1888—the former year marking the commencement of the Positivist Era. I dwell on this relation of the year rather than on that in which it stands to the crisis, or the French—I might say European—Revolution, for it is the more important relation of the two rightly considered. With no disparagement of the Revolution as a whole, if we must grieve over many of its incidents; with due honour for its martyrs; with sorrow for the suffering which has accompanied it; with gratitude for the benefits it has conferred; in a word, with ample recognition both of its necessity and of its services, we have yet to clear ourselves from it, to leave it behind us; to judge it as we judge other historical facts; as we judge, for instance, the Protestant Reformation of the 16th century—to judge it as a thing of the past. Full allowance can still be made for the actual facts of our revolutionary time; there need be no blindness to the reality.

We are yet in the Revolution and of it, and must count with it, only we concentrate our main attention not on it, but on what is to succeed it; not on the process of decomposition, but on the new order. As in the evolution of the Medieval organisation, throughout the ten centuries which that evolution occupied, the main efforts of the human mind were directed on the work of construction, directed, that is, away from the order which it had cost so much to establish, but which was found inadequate for the social wants of mankind, so should it be in our analogous movement. Nothing should distract our attention from the social reconstruction which is the task of the new Religion. In it lies the hope of Humanity—in that which forwards its advent lies the true sphere of all Positivist thought and action.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

Born at Leamington Hastings, Warwickshire,
September 4th, 1888.

55, *Palace Gardens Terrace,*
London, W.

(I.)—*The Sacerdotal Fund.*

Balance from previous years.....	£338	6	8
Transferred to the Printing Fund	138	6	8
Total.....	£200	0	0

(II.)—*Subscriptions for the year 100 (1888).*

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Occidental III	{	Minimum	0	1	0	
		Mean	2	11	5½	
		Maximum	50	0	0	
Oriental... 19	{	Minimum	0	3	0	
		Mean	0	18	10	
		Maximum	4	10	0	
Total... 130						
	Total		£303	14	8	
	Interest on Investment		24	18	1	
	Total		£328	12	9	

(III.)—*Expenses for the year 100 (1888).*

London Room :—	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Rent	55	0	0			
Gas and Firing ..	3	12	11			
Wages	26	17	4			
Various Items.....	8	7	4			
Social Meetings	1	15	8			
Organ	12	0	0			
Library and Tablet	3	8	7			
Mr. Quin.....				111	1	10
Leicester Room				40	0	0
Administration				6	0	0
				30	0	0
Total expenses				187	1	10
Balance				141	10	11
				£328	12	9

(IV.)—Amount for the year	£	s.	d.
90 (1878)	156	13	0
" " " 91 (1879)	260	0	0
" " " 92 (1880)	325	19	6
" " " 93 (1881)	283	16	11
" " " 94 (1882)	264	19	4
" " " 95 (1883)	320	12	6
" " " 96 (1884)	319	2	7
" " " 97 (1885)	302	15	10
" " " 98 (1886)	322	10	0
" " " 99 (1887)	330	15	9
" " " 100 (1888)	303	14	8

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

LOVE FOR PRINCIPLE
AND ORDER FOR BASIS;
PROGRESS FOR END.

LIVE FOR OTHERS.

LIVE OPENLY.

TWELFTH ANNUAL CIRCULAR

ADDRESSED TO EVERY SUBSCRIBER TO THE VOLUNTARY
FUND INSTITUTED BY AUGUSTE COMTE ON BEHALF
OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF HUMANITY.

London, 15 Moses 102 (15 January, 1890).

The formation of the Positivist Priesthood is become the first condition of a renovation which is as imperatively demanded by order as by progress. Positivists at the outset had to ascend from faith to love, but henceforward they should give the preference to the more rapid and more effective method which leads downward from love to faith.

AUGUSTE COMTE.

SIR or MADAM,

The accounts show a certain increase, both in the amount of the subscriptions and in the number of contributors. Some who had intermitted their help from circumstances or inattention have returned to us. Some give a contribution avowedly temporary. Lastly, there have been thirteen new subscribers, on whose perseverance we may fairly count, as their subscription is an act of adhesion, when no proviso to the contrary is made. Subscription, as I have said in former circulars, need not be an act of adhesion. It is not so in all cases actually. We receive assistance, even at present, from some who are not adherents of Positivism, or even likely to become adherents. In the circulars of Auguste Comte we find the case considered, and an appeal for help addressed even to theological opponents of his teaching. In our own day we might appeal, passing by direct opponents, to the now numerous class which is detached from the older faiths and is looking for a new one. Many of this class derive, as is clear from the writings of the day, not to speak of personal experience, very distinct benefits from the conceptions of our philosophical and even more of our religious system. Without decided adhesion, from which under one impulse or another they shrink, the propagation of that system has a claim on them in

proportion to the extent in which they share its convictions, feel its utility or accept its guidance.

I repeat without insistence my wishes as to the payment of subscriptions: that it should be regular, earlier in the year—a large amount still coming in December, when I am most pressed,—and paid without reminder—this last request has been more attended to—paid in short as an accepted obligation. The minimum fixed was three shillings, but I have no hesitation in accepting smaller sums as representing the goodwill of the giver, and aware as I am of the heavy pressure of daily life. The application of any surplus will be as before to the printing fund, the demand on which, for the year now beginning, will be considerable, as I have not yet had the account for printing the translation of the *Appel aux Conservateurs*, and other similar publications. A translation of the Introduction to the *Subjective Synthesis* is preparing for the press.

In the year under review I have given further assistance to Dr. Lagarrigue for his printing, as also towards defraying the cost of publishing Auguste Comte's letters to Messrs. Edger and Metcalf. We have in England issued two other collections of his letters: those to Messrs. Fisher and Ellis, and those I received from him.

Apart from the translation above mentioned of the *Appel aux Conservateurs*, the pendant to the *Catechism*, a work of the highest importance to us in our present transitional state, these latter publications are the main feature of the year's printing. They make more complete our direct connection with our Master. Without criticism, I mention some others which I have received over and above the usual circulars:

Mr. H. Crompton's Sermon on the first of the year.

Two pamphlets of Dr. Jorge Lagarrigue—(1) *Lettre à M. le Dr. Robinet*, (2) *Les partis actuels*.

A pamphlet from M. J. E. Lagarrigue.

And lastly, from M. Laffitte, *The First Philosophy*.

a work the importance of which all must allow, whatever the judgment as to its execution. I should offer no opinion had I read it: I have not yet had time to read it. In his twelfth Confession, Auguste Comte announces his intention of writing on this subject in the year 1870, and explains the value he attaches to it. It was, therefore, a work wanted, and, whilst here, as elsewhere, we cannot but regret the incompleteness of the great plan by the same architect, we should be grateful for the effort to supply an acknowledged want. I have no doubt the book contains much of value and interest, whatever the judgment that may be formed of it as a whole or on detached portions.

In connection with the subject of publications, it may interest some to know of a German work on the Founder of the Religion of Humanity, or Positivism, as the title limits it. The author is a German Jesuit. Its full title is:

'August Comte, der Begründer des Positivismus, von Hermann Gruber, S.J. Freiburg im Brisgau. Herdersche Verlags-handlung. 1889.'

It bears witness to the increase of attention given to Comte's name and work, and the growing influence of his construction in Germany, where the silence has seemed so profound and deliberate. I do not know that it has for us any other value. Intellectually, it is fair. It is entirely deficient in all moral sympathy, exemplifying the dryness of feeling which accompanies not unfrequently the religious writing of the theological school.

The English Positivists, for whom I write primarily, have been exempt this year from loss by death. Yet we have had a real loss in Mdme. Umanski, one of M. Frey's Russian group, who intellectually bore the same relation to us as he did. In her case, as in his, there was a true moral tie. And any intellectual divergence was overridden by the influence of the very beautiful character, which all recognised, even those who knew her but very slightly. Quite outside the Positivist circle she impressed very deeply those with whom her illness brought her into contact. Devotion to the suffering, devotion to the cause, the firmest trust in the Religion of Humanity, the most ardent desire to enlarge its church, with a very gentle, yet very noble nature, corresponding to her striking personal aspect—by all this she has left us a memory strengthening the already strong influence of our dead.

On the subject of our inner differences, the differences as between those who, in some sort or another, are considered Positivists, much might be said. I select certain points suggested by them. I shall leave M. Lemos' note to the judgment of others. A long experience of personal attacks has not weakened my conviction that the best way to meet them is to accept them in silence. I have scarcely ever, if ever, answered them directly. I leave, therefore, what M. Lemos says, and what I have said, to the judgment of others, with only one remark: that whilst I accept fully the responsibility of what I have written; whilst I always write under the sense of such responsibility, so to ensure the utmost caution and moderation, I do not hold myself responsible for any given use which opponents may make of my words. It is impossible to guard against every construction or misconstruction. Much must be left available for those who wish to give a certain colour to statements, to turn them to account for their own purposes. Write carefully yet boldly, and leave the effect to itself.

The case is different where remarks on my expressions reach me from thoroughly friendly sources. In the earlier months of the year, in two instances, I received comments on the language of my circular, which made it clear that it was open to a certain misinterpretation, whilst those who wrote did not misinterpret it. I quote, adapting it to my purpose, but without alteration of the words, the language of one of my friends: 'The conciliating tone of your latest circular should not be taken—as perhaps it is supposed to mean—to imply a surrender of your independence in principle, or an abandonment of your attitude about Positivism as a religion.' Something of the same impression as that conveyed in these words had been made on my other friendly correspondent on a first reading—an impression, namely, that I had gone too far in conciliation, but on examination he recognised the distinction drawn in the quotation I have given, and the necessity of always adhering to the direction of Auguste Comte, conveyed in the line:

'Conciliatory in act, inflexible in principle.'

I add on this subject that the article in the *Revue Occidentale*, which was sent me in this particular case (for I do not see that publication as a rule), had its own object. I need say no more of it than what I wrote at the time to a friend. 'I look upon it,' I said, 'as insidious and impertinent.' It should, by the way, have had not the initials, but the full name, and the age of the writer, appended to it. The age often affects the value of a judgment.

On the whole matter, I may say that I had rather err in excess than in defect of conciliation; would keep as much friendliness in personal relations and not as little as possible; that I have no fear of falling short

in the strength of my opposition to those who differ from me as the direction at Newton Hall differs, but rather feel exposed to the opposite danger. I would write as temperately as I can, even with regard to the past year, and confining myself to that year strictly. But it is difficult not to speak strongly as one watches one utterance after another issuing from the above-mentioned direction—utterances of a nature to lower the whole character of the Positivist effort, and to reduce it to I can hardly say what, in order, apparently, to disarm the frivolous opposition of an incompetent public. It is very sad to see such a handling of noble conceptions, such a presentment of the greatest religious change ever placed before the world to guide and to save it. But we have to abide the temporary tyranny of the pen and the press, of all the noisy public opinion around us, and wait till it be overpast.

We may turn from all the ordinary machinery which seems to most so strong—the machinery, I mean, for fabricating or leading opinion, and which we are forbidden to use; we may turn in confidence to our Master's teaching as quite capable of superseding it all, gradually eliminating it by its own superiority. The portions of that teaching which have come to us this year strengthen the confidence based on former writings of far deeper significance, most especially on the contents of the volume entitled *Le Testament d'Auguste Comte*. It is well to call attention to that volume on all occasions.

There are certain points connected with his writings on which I would touch. I see from time to time quotations of Comte's formulas and more pregnant sentences. It is most useful to spread them; but we should all take great care to spread them in as correct a form as possible, aiming at great precision in our translations, not trifling with them and giving loose and inaccurate renderings which may seem apt for the time, but which miss their educational value. As an instance of the care needed by us all, I take the well-known formula which embodies Love, Order, and Progress. At the close of the tenth Confession, the tenth Sainte-Clotilde, we have its author's way of looking at this formula, and on such a point he alone is competent:—'This conversation has just suggested the happy thought of modifying, as I have done this morning, in good time, I doubt not, the fundamental formula of our religion. In it I combine the second term with the first, whilst I isolate the last. So long as the task was to overcome the revolt of the intellect against the heart and the separation of progress from order, the original form continued to be preferable. But, my last volume having satisfied these two conditions, this new statement of the formula will better set forth the religious constitution of Positivism, the alliance of love and faith to guide activity. It represents unity as resulting from the concurrence of the sympathy within and the order without us, and so enables us the better to regulate our whole existence—even our physical existence—on the basis of a consistently altruistic destination allotted to it.' The change introduced may be marked by the punctuation:

Love for Principle
and Order for Basis ;—
Progress for End.

So again in the use of terms. Many that we use are objected to by those who hear them for the first time, or on superficial grounds suggested by prevalent modes of thought or by long-rooted prejudices. But we ought not to yield to such objections. It is only adjourning, and by adjourning increasing the difficulty. Veneration for a great leader-

ship, confidence in a great wisdom, imitation of a great courage, all conspire to urge us to this course. Conciliation of the existing tendencies in theory is weak.

In my review of the Positivist centres in connection with our own, I have, in reference to Calcutta, to record the continuance of the action there. I have also to acknowledge a work on Morals by the author of *Brahman the Priest*, a work full of thought, the aim of which is to offer his countrymen, in a form adapted to their present wants, the conclusions of the organised moral science. The degree in which the writer attains his immediate object I feel unable to judge from want of knowledge of the environment which he addresses. But the book has a value quite independent of such a result. It draws attention to a want, and its suggestiveness may constitute its main value. It will direct thought aright, and that none the less because it does not meet with the acceptance which would make it of immediate use, as a kind of handbook for students, or as a work introduced officially into the collegiate or school curriculum. There are books which are more seminal than directly productive.

Our Indian co-religionists, as their countrymen around them, are liable to constant disturbance from the Anglo-Indian community, and from the action of government which that community calls for and abets. Indians are right, I think, in resisting such action when it is directed against their traditional social regulations. The Government of India should, as all governments in fact should, keep to the task of maintaining material order, not interfere with arrangements and institutions which can only be wisely modified from within. I allude to such questions as infant marriage and the regulations of widowhood. The insolent attempt of Englishmen to foist on the people they govern their own crude and often unwarrantable notions should be repelled. One of our Hindu co-religionists, Babu Tripura Charan Banerjea, has examined the latter of the two questions with great care, and his conclusions are well supported. They have the greater interest for that they are in full accord with those of Comte on second marriages. Outside Positivism there is a very strong opinion, of great antiquity and sanctioned by the Roman Catholic Church, in favour of perpetual widowhood, especially as concerns women. That it should be extended to men is for us beyond question, in neither case however by any legal enactment. But enough for my purpose if it be allowed as regards women. For that suffices to show how unseemly it is for the Anglo-Indian governors to be obtruding on the Hindu what is really disclaimed to so great an extent at home. It is an instance of the ill effects of an unsound liberalism untampered by sympathy with a different order of social and religious life.

The theocratic order of which India is the highest existing representative should be scrupulously respected and its development left to itself. What aid it may get from without it should determine for itself. Were England alive to her duty, and not swayed by her own imperial interests, the guarding of Indian independence in all that concerns the religious and social advance of her dependency would be her first consideration.

I spoke last year of Dr. Carson's illness as weighing on the Positivist cause in Liverpool. It has continued to do so during the year just ended, and we enter on its successor with no hope of amendment. Still, under all adverse circumstances, the work in that centre, the religious effort, will continue unabated in zeal and determination, if necessarily with a certain change. It will be carried on by one engaged in the practical business of life, and will take its character from such a condition; will

require more decidedly the fraternal co-operation of all concerned in order to support and encourage a fraternal leading; in a truly Positivist spirit, making the best of the means actually within reach. Respect, strong respect for him who undertakes such a task, mutual consultation under the influence of such respect, the devotion of all to a cause completely common—if such are, as they will be, the dominant sentiments, they will ensure the permanence of the work already done, and give promise of due advance. On the Liverpool centre there rests also the strongest of all influences, with its deepest root in the past, but constantly showing fresh vitality in the present, the influence of noble and devoted women, of itself the sure pledge for the future.

It should be our main effort to secure a similar influence in Birmingham, where, speaking of the last year, there has been no change on the year before. But it is most probable that, with the elements as they exist, there will continue a Positivist movement and that it will eventually take the form of some combined action. To be really effective, such action must seek the co-operation of women, and there is ground for saying that such aid will not be wanting. It may be but from few at first; that is of little consequence. Very few are needed to shake the prevailing indifference and to form a centre. Meanwhile, there is always room for each Positivist's action and devotion to his cause. Our system appeals above all others to individual effort in life and conduct.

There has been quiet perseverance in Newcastle, in the face of all difficulties and discouragements. In such persistence lies our hope, for the essential is, there as elsewhere, to tide over the immediate present and its manifold opposition, passive and active, by the help of a strong faith in the future.

We have had to change our Leicester room, as the house was wanted by the municipal authorities. It was with great regret that we met in the old room for the last time in September. All felt the breach in associations which the giving it up involved. Attachment to places consecrated by memories grows so rapidly. We have to do the best we can under the circumstances, and, fortunately, Mrs. Findley can still offer a meeting-place for the Positivist families in Leicester. This is enough for the present. For many reasons it was much to be desired that she should continue the centre of their religious action. The innermost chain of association is kept unbroken by her holding this position, for it is to her husband that our Leicester Positivist memories necessarily recur. Here, as everywhere, we are under the government of the dead. And of Leicester it may be said that the family influences through the true representatives of the family are strong in this small but united centre.

In Chapel Street all has gone on as usual. It was necessary, if only for the repairs (for a re-decoration which has been successfully carried out), to close our Sunday meetings for a time. It was necessary besides to secure an interval of rest for those on whom the labour of continuing the work fell. Sufficient continuity was maintained by the two intervening festivals—the Festival of the Virgin-Mother in August, the commemoration of Auguste Comte in September. Many amongst us, however, felt the want of the usual services and the support of a weekly assembling, whilst accepting the necessity of interruption.

The continuous effort of the last few years was shown by the regret felt at its temporary cessation not to have been thrown away. The exertion has resulted in closer personal union and a stronger sense of the advantages of such union. This is unquestionably fostered by our

meeting often and regularly, though under our circumstances complete regularity is of very difficult attainment. It is much that we estimate more highly than we did the good of such regularity. As our social feeling gains in strength it will raise this estimate. Every one can do so much for his neighbour in this respect. More and more, Positivists should look to their social duty and not to their own individual gain or loss. On the whole, if there is no ground for undue confidence,—we are, in truth, but too sheltered by facts from any such feeling—on a review of the year, there is ground for an increase of confidence as a support to us in our work. I mean in reference to our particular work in connection with Chapel Street. In the larger sphere outside there can be no hesitation on the subject, there is abundant confirmation of our faith in our ultimate triumph. But in our narrower, more proper world some might not unnaturally hesitate. I can but give my impression: that essentially, under the more important aspects of feelings and habits, there is to be traced an advance. All else is comparatively unimportant. What we are is the real question, not how many, though even on this point there is growth.

For any other considerations as regards Chapel Street I refer to my last circular, in which I enlarged on its representative character and aim, as also on its immediate direction and the spirit by which it was animated.

For Brazil, too, I may refer to the last circular, in part at least. The year has been a marked one, however, and calls for something more. We must wait, even now, for further information on the recent revolution. But some results are clear. The change from the Empire to the Republic can hardly be reversed, if we take into account all the circumstances of the case, especially the one capital consideration that Brazil is thus placed on the same footing as all her neighbours, and shares in the general forward impulse towards the ultimate form of human political society—the Republic.

The newer worlds into which Europe has overflowed can none of them be under the mastery of the older traditional form of government. The independence of the Northern United States was a pledge of the independence, in time, of the States of Central and Southern America. The Republican government adopted by those States was a pledge of a similar decision by the others when their independence came. And it is hardly an unwarrantable assumption that so large a balance in favour of Republican institutions will sway with the remaining monarchical fragments in America, reducing by its action the two continents to a parity throughout of governments. The parity will extend to the general external form at any rate, leaving to each state or union of states the free moulding to their peculiar use of such general form. Year by year, with noiseless step, the Republic draws nearer, even for Europe. Each addition to the two leading Republican powers, France and North America, renders the step firmer. We may well congratulate our Brazilian co-religionists on the advance of their country, by the abolition of slavery first, then by the recent change. In both Positivism has been felt, and it will be felt in the further step to which the Brazilian Positivists have drawn attention: the reparation due to the indigenous population. The adoption of the political motto of Positivism, *Order and Progress*, as the national motto of Brazil, is a distinct progress on the two great Republics I have named. Frankly and avowedly Brazil is thus placed at the true human point of view, completing in a Positive sense the elimination of the monarchical element. All reliance on the King for reorganisation disappears.

So satisfactory a general attitude would seem enough for the present, and to take it was quite within the competence of government. So far as I can judge, it would consist neither with sound statesmanship, nor with Positivist principles, to go farther and bring the weight of a central authority to bear in introducing, or pressing on a very divided population, any more of the institutions of the new religion. To spread such conceptions must be trusted to other influences, and changes must be the result of their spread, not in any sense the cause. By a divided population I mean only that there is no unity of religious belief, the popular Catholicism having by no means so far given way before the undermining influences of other thought, as to welcome an immediate substitution. The brusque imposition of alien institutions has, I can well believe, never been thought of by the new government. What more negative changes might be possible, such, for instance, as the separation of the spiritual and temporal powers, is another question. But for all the details of an event of such interest we must be content to wait at present. It must be our hearty wish that all may go on prosperously and orderly in the new Republic.

Neither the Annual Report of M. Lemos, nor his more recent publication, *Pour notre maître et notre foi*, could touch on this political question. Both testify to the continuance of his vigour and activity. Of the first I have already spoken. The second should be read in conjunction with the articles in the *Revue Occidentale*, to which it is an answer. I could wish a more temperate reply. I could wish more restraint in language, more discrimination in the phrases used. Human language is a sacred institution which we as Positivists have to guard carefully, and there is nothing which time tests more surely than the language of denunciation. All, for instance, who honour Milton with the due veneration must regret, as a sad drawback to his prose works, the abuse he lavishes on opponents. Any violence moreover tells beyond its immediate object. It frightens the quiet and the moderate. Some may even be deterred from exerting such energy as they have by the sense of the risk they run of being exposed to a vehement condemnation for not going far enough. Again, whilst recognising that some strife is an almost inevitable accompaniment of a great religious change, a purely human religion may well deal with dissension in a calmer way than its theological ancestors, as enlightened by their experience, and taught by more soundly based views of man's nature to make greater allowance for its very complicated influences. So much said, on the other hand there is much in M. Lemos' utterance which is useful for us all. For my own share in his objections I do not hesitate to accept it as beneficial and as true. In the matter of the *Revue*, looking back, M. Lemos is right as to the line I took. I was under the influence of peculiar circumstances. Not repeating what I said in the paper which is referred to, I ought to have opposed all periodical publications with no exception. It was a concession I made, one of many, from the desire to secure the largest amount of united action which could be secured between French and English Positivism. I was in error in making this concession, and I am not disposed to quarrel with the condemnation of my error.

Our past is a very mixed one. The twenty years during which I acted in concert with M. Laffitte were constantly throwing up new difficulties, and only a strong sense of the importance of union with France overcame the natural consequences of such difficulties. I should have acted more wisely had I changed my position at a much earlier period—had I set aside the semblance of direction long before I did. But

there was much room for hesitation. Those who came later to the work find it hard, perhaps, to understand our embarrassments. They will do well, however, to make allowance for a very tentative course, and to remember that the generation they succeed was in different circumstances, both by its origin and antecedents and by virtue of the originally very gradual introduction of the religion. They will do well to remember that the action of that generation, and the results attained, have cleared up many doubtful points; that others have been cleared by the spread of fuller knowledge and the more complete possession of Auguste Comte's thoughts. All this opens an easier path for the generation which inherits it, a generation which has not grown up as our generation before the religion was instituted, but which received it as a heritage. Its task is lighter, were it only by the guidance to be derived from the shortcomings of their predecessors. But they have much more than shortcomings to look back on. Much had been done when they entered on their career.

Dr. Lagarrigue's illness has necessarily suspended his direct work in Paris. All of us feel the strongest wish that he may soon return to it with recovered health and energy. In regard to that work, I may observe that the collapse, for the time, of General Boulanger may seem to invalidate such qualified support as was given him, but it need not impugn the soundness of the general political judgment, given by Messrs. Lagarrigue and Audiffrent, in favour of a dictatorial, as against a parliamentary, government of France. The individual representative may be unequal to the task—may or may not be—but the task remains, the demand is there and will have to be met in some adequate form. Essentially Dr. Robinet seems to agree so far, whilst rejecting the particular person. All that we can wish is the peaceful escape of France from the actual form of government, a quiet evolution, not a revolution, in the direction indicated. Under very peculiar circumstances the danger which seemed imminent was averted and calm was preserved. But a temporary adjournment of difficulties is not a removal of them, and with the most limited means of direct observation, if we retrace the course of later history, we may well question whether the judgment to which reference has been made is not the one which the future will sanction.

For the other groups—Newton Hall, North London, and Manchester—they must stand or fall with the Parisian body to which they look, must share the responsibility which attaches to it, and to M. Laffitte in particular, for the direction given to its action and its thought. On the disastrous character of that direction I will not now insist.

The letters of Auguste Comte which have been published suggest one or two remarks. They confirm and supplement his *Circulars*, which are the direct expression of his general guidance of his disciples. The spirit and tone of both *Letters* and *Circulars* are in complete agreement. Both show, side by side with great vigour of rejection, the greatest patience with imperfect adherents, a cordial acceptance of, even gratitude for, such partial support as they could give him. They evince the true priestly attitude of strengthening and encouraging the weak, putting before them a near goal to which they might advance with a consequent hope of further progress. They are free also from all nationalism whilst judging firmly each nation. They are full of the warmest personal sympathy shown in the readiness to enter into all the details of each existence, whilst at the same time they connect each correspondent with all the larger aspects opened by his peculiar circumstances.

I have already expressed my regret that I did not correspond more frequently with him. There is another point on which I take this opportunity of speaking. I will be brief on a personal explanation. Auguste Comte proposed to me, and I accepted the task, to write a Positivist History of the English Revolution. I have not fulfilled my engagement as yet, and it must remain uncertain whether I ever fulfil it. I have never forgotten it. Had he lived I have no doubt that, well or ill, I should have discharged the task. But it has not been owing to the withdrawal of his powerful support and encouragement that I have left it unperformed. His death changed the whole face of our affairs, and I thought it right to meet the change by a corresponding change in what I did. I threw myself into the work of propagating directly the new religion, and of forming opinion and action to that end. The object at bottom of the intended book was to spread ideas indicating the necessity of a great religious renovation, which should continue and absorb all other efforts of the same kind. Essentially this has been, without interruption, the aim I have set before me. It has found me work enough to do, and I have been compelled to adjourn the special work in question, which had a peculiar attraction for me in itself. It has been a constant sacrifice to me to renounce, in the degree in which I have renounced it, the historical study to which by training and taste I had always been drawn. Could I have pursued it, my lot would have been cast in pleasanter places. Be this as it may, the result has been a busy and a wearing life, but a life unquestionably devoted to the cause which the history was to secure in another manner.

To return. *Circulars* and *Letters* both help to show us the right path in our difficulties. Both breathe vigour and tolerance. The course of events within the sphere of Positivist action enforces the conclusion that the practical study of Comte's works is the best safeguard in our own management. They alone place us at the true point of view, not merely on the larger questions of policy or religion, but in the domain of our personal feelings and conduct as Positivists. They enable us to judge ourselves in that respect, and they divert us from the pernicious outside influences of literature, or science, or political agitation. They are strong in rejection, when rejection is needed. They are strong also in tolerance, in the guidance they give as to those who are being drawn towards the Religion of Humanity, or who are hesitating in their acceptance. The very gradual growth of a Positivist life—of convictions, feelings, habits—is allowed for. There is the greatest patience, the most trying self-command exhibited. Convictions are to be let to grow from within; there is no impatience shown which might repel. We are taught by them that unbounded confidence in our Master, a strong sense of our own faithfulness to him, may coexist with the toleration of those in whom such feelings are weak. Perfect satisfaction in the Religion of Humanity may coexist with endurance of the most misgiving approach. These considerations make conciliation an imperative duty, and the imperfection which in the past most of us must confess to in regard to our own efforts makes the duty more stringent. We see how we were waited for, how generously we were dealt with.

These remarks have been drawn from me by the *Letters* published this year. I hasten to the conclusion of this circular, in which I hope they are not out of place. They are conceived in the spirit of veneration for the teaching of Auguste Comte, which I should wish to preside over all I write. We may all move on confidently in proportion as we are truly guided by this spirit. The silent years bring fruit beyond what is apparent. We have seen this in our earlier course, we may see it

now. Success as generally estimated is a very fallacious test—on a truer estimate is always in our power in a certain measure. Disregarding both success and failure, we can abide by the quiet discharge of our duty. That suffices.

RICHARD CONGREVE,

Born at Leamington Hastings, Warwickshire,
September 4th, 1818.

55, Palace Gardens Terrace, Kensington, London, W.

(I.)—*The Sacerdotal Fund.*

	£	s.	d.
Balance from previous years	200	0	0
For 1888	141	10	11
Total	£341	10	11

(II.)—*Subscriptions for the year 101 (1889).*

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Occidental 136.....	(Minimum	0	0	6		
	Mean.....	2	4	2	300	6
	Maximum.....	50	0	0		10
Oriental 17.....	(Minimum	0	4	6		
	Mean.....	1	0	5½	17	8
	Maximum.....	4	10	0		0
Total... 153	Total	£317	14	10		

(III.)—*Expenses for the year 101 (1889).*

London Room :—	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Rent	55	0	0			
Gas and Firing	2	4	4			
Wages	26	17	4			
Various Items	3	18	8			
Social Meetings	1	9	5			
Organ	12	10	0			
Redecoration	13	10	0			
Newcastle Church				115	9	9
Mr. Quin				10	0	0
Leicester Room				40	0	0
Administration				6	0	0
				30	0	0
Total Expenses	201	9	9			
Balance	116	5	1			
	£317	14	10			

(IV.)—Amount for the year 90 (1878)	£	s.	d.
" " " 91 (1879)	156	13	0
" " " 92 (1880)	260	0	0
" " " 93 (1881)	325	19	6
" " " 94 (1882)	283	16	11
" " " 95 (1883)	264	19	4
" " " 96 (1884)	320	12	6
" " " 97 (1885)	319	2	7
" " " 98 (1886)	302	15	10
" " " 99 (1887)	322	10	0
" " " 100 (1888)	330	15	9
" " " 101 (1889)	303	14	8
" " " 101 (1889)	317	14	10

MMM

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

LOVE FOR PRINCIPLE
AND ORDER FOR BASIS;
PROGRESS FOR END.

LIVE FOR OTHERS.

LIVE OPENLY.

THIRTEENTH ANNUAL CIRCULAR

ADDRESSED TO EVERY SUBSCRIBER TO THE VOLUN-
TARY FUND INSTITUTED BY AUGUSTE COMTE ON
BEHALF OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF HUMANITY.

London, 15 Moses 103 (15 January, 1891).

The formation of the Positivist Priesthood is become the first condition of a renovation which is as imperatively demanded by order as by progress.

Positivists at the outset had to ascend from faith to love, but henceforward they should give the preference to the more rapid and more effective method which leads downward from love to faith.

AUGUSTE COMTE.

SIR OR MADAM,

The result of the year's accounts is a certain diminution in the number of subscribers, whilst the amount subscribed is slightly increased. There has been less need to remind contributors of their payments. This is a satisfactory circumstance. I could still wish that payments be made earlier where it is not inconvenient to do so. It is an object with me to have the month of December clear in that respect, for time is particularly valuable then.

The application of the fund remains essentially the same as hitherto. I thought it desirable to testify our sympathy with the Brazilian body, under the direction of M. Lemos, by a contribution—a donation of course—to the building which they are erecting. It will place them on a sound footing as being their own in full property. It has been most successfully begun, a great amount of very friendly feeling having been shown. I wish we could place ourselves in the same position here, on a freehold tenure, that is.

I have to correct a statement of last year's circular. I was in error as to the assistance given to Dr. Lagarrigue in Paris. It was limited to helping in the publication of the letters of Auguste Comte to Messrs. Edger and Metcalf, not given generally for Dr. Lagarrigue's printing as stated in the circular (p. 2.)

One or two of the publications of the year I shall notice later. The more important ones that I may mention here are:—

- (1). The *Letters* of our Master to Mr. Hutton, the value and interest of which all their readers must acknowledge.
- (2). The English translation of the *Philosophical Letter on Marriage*.
- (3). The Portuguese translation of the *Calendar*.
- (4). The Portuguese translation of the *Catechism*.
- (5). The third French edition of the *Catechism*.
- (6). I had hoped to be able to add as completed within the year, the English translation of the Introduction to the *Subjective Synthesis*. But I have had under other pressure to delay it in the printing. It will, however, I confidently hope, be accessible by the time this circular reaches those to whom it is addressed, as it has now undergone the final revision, and may be struck off without further delay.

We have had heavy losses by death in the year. The Liverpool centre has suffered the most. Dr. Carson's long illness, which had of late so crippled his action, ended fatally in March, depriving by a premature loss the cause of the Positive Religion of one of its most zealous and most influential servants, cutting short the full development of a heart and intellect which were constantly entering into completer possession of themselves, and bending themselves more devotedly to the service of Humanity. Two others of Her servants have been taken in the course of the year, two women, Mrs. Taylor and Mrs. Barber, the one of simplest affectionate nature who could take her *Catechism* to read by the grave of a lost and honoured friend, seeking insight through feeling, the other of more intellectual vigour, but not less convinced as a disciple, who had found the new Faith sufficient support in the prospect of an early death.

Later in the year, in August, Positivism suffered two losses: in Mr. Mark Call and M. Joseph Lonchampt. The two were very differently related to our cause. Mr. Call cannot be claimed as a Positivist. His wish to have nothing said at his grave shows that he stood apart from any constituted body. But he had for many years given money aid to our action, though not mixing in it otherwise. His writings also helped us, if not so decidedly as we could have wished. We had from him the earliest recognition of the *Catechism* on its appearance in an English dress. His *Reverberations*, with their autobiographical preface, are full of the Positivist influence. In the translation of the '*Discourse on the Positive Spirit*,' which our printing fund published for him, we have a direct contribution. He could not give us his full assent. He was afraid, he told me once, that the system might be oppressive to science. But he was a helper by his total and unflinching rejection, and that after full and competent examination confirmed by continued reflection of all the teachings of theology, as also by his strong if partial sympathy — 'one thing I see,' he said to me, and repeatedly, 'you have nothing in the field against you.' I touch chiefly on the public aspect of his death, as is natural here. A word only must be allowed of deep regret for the loss of his most kindly and instructive social intercourse, continued for twenty-six years.

M. Lonchampt's is a different case. As may be seen in our records, in the *Testament*, and in various letters, he was one of Auguste Comte's most valued disciples, the one who was present at his death, and who has continued faithful throughout to his memory. If somewhat deficient in vigour of character, in the energy required to give expression to his

MMM 2

* written mark with Call, M.A. died August 1890

convictions, those convictions have never faltered, neither has his feeling of veneration for his Master been ever shaken. I lose much in him. For whilst remaining with M. Laffitte—'he could not stand alone', he said—he never hesitated in his assent to my views of the real want in our Positivist action, in his sense of the deficiency in the conduct of the Parisian movement. 'Everything has to be done,' he said to me, 'as far as the religion is concerned.'

In Newcastle we have lost Mr. Robertson, a working man of acknowledged efficiency in his own particular calling, who gave his complete adhesion to the Religion of Humanity, adopting it as his rule of life, and conforming his habits to it. He had been a Secularist and active in industrial disputes, and had earned the respect of his own class. He brought us therefore a most valuable support. Long of weak health, he died early, at the age of 51, strengthening in death the Newcastle Positivist tradition, but depriving the small body there of his active co-operation and consistent sympathy. Another loss is that of Mr. Isaac Harrison, an employer. From health and under the pressure of business he had not been in active agreement during life. But his full Positivist sympathy was shown by his expressed wish that Mr. Quin might direct his burial. Such recognitions are of great use.

Lastly, I have to mention the death of Mr. J. W. Overton, the author of *Saul of Mitre Court*, a working man, a coppersmith, one who was true to his class, perhaps even with an over-sensitiveness. He had been for some years separated from me for reasons on which I need not enter. I regretted his separation, for I had felt the value of his co-operation as of his society. His illness drew us together again, and restored his communication with our body, and with the members of it whom he had most valued. The renewal of this intercourse was a source of pleasure to him. It was not doubtful—he made it quite clear—that he regretted the interruption of friendliness, as he regretted also the change it had made in his own work. 'He had done no good,' he said, 'since he had left me.' But in any case his too early death deprives our movement of one well qualified by the depth of his convictions, drawn from a constant meditation of the doctrines and objects of the new religion and fortified by the practice in his own way of its worship, qualified also by a real nobility of nature and generosity in action, to exert a widespread and growing influence on those among whom his lot was cast, and for whom he was unsparing of effort. His life seconded his intellectual ability and insight, and this happy combination would have gained, in natural course, additional weight. I have said thus much because of the peculiarity of his position.

I follow the same order as in my last Circular in regard to the various Positivist centres. In Calcutta the difficulties incident to our beginnings are not lessening. There has been less of continuity in the joint action of the Positivist body, owing to circumstances independent of Positivism, and the regularity of its meetings is more threatened than it was. The immediate future is in that respect rather uncertain. Apart from such meetings, the numbers remain the same, and I have no reason to doubt that the friendliness and union—the fraternity of the Indian group—will continue unimpaired.

If I return on any more general Indian question it is only to emphasize what I said in my last circular, as to the true attitude of the Indian government whilst it remains in the hands of Englishmen. There is an increasing pressure brought to bear upon it in the opposite direction. With the usual English feeling of superiority, instead of mending ourselves we are but too anxious to intrude our crude action

on others as necessary reforms. This has been seen the last year, notably in relation to infant marriage. A certain evil is seen and there is at once a cry for a legislative reform, a coarse and unwise mode of proceeding. Respect for the civilisation on which we have thrust ourselves, and patient waiting for its own change from within, where change is desirable—we cannot too consistently or energetically assert these principles. The quietest but most determined resistance to the premature enforcement of the revolutionary ideas of the West, to its interference on such questions, however specious the grounds for such interference, this is the course I should be glad to see adopted by Indians of all classes.

For Positivist action in India, whatever turn the conduct of the group may take for the present, under very difficult conditions, I think there are two directions in which it should assert itself, over and above the negative quiet resistance to unwise Western interference before alluded to. In both I believe I shall have the concurrence of those who hold the front place in the Indian movement. They are rightly bent on tracing the connecting links between the faith they have inherited and that which they have adopted, grooving the old into the new, so to smooth over the passage from the one to the other. The organisation of the Brahmanical Society, as well as the special institutions of the religious system on which it rests, seem to afford ample opportunities for the application of this method, for the preservation in short of continuity. The second object is the spreading as quickly and as widely as possible the central idea of the new faith, the conception of Humanity as an organic whole, of which all nations are integral portions, each with its own obligations, all bound to mutual support and protection, forming one brotherhood, wherein the idea of domination is wholly alien, the idea of fraternal co-operation paramount. The acceptance of Humanity as the ultimate controlling influence in all human relations is the one important primary step.

Familiarity with this conception will throw light on all other difficulties, and its propagation can go forward without touching other embarrassing questions, and free from all character of opposition. It promotes the growth of a spirit of union, concert, and mutual respect, whilst it leaves the subordinate movements to be dealt with on their own merits, and I may add under the enlightening influence of the more general principle of human community.

Of the losses which the Liverpool centre has sustained I have already spoken. It meets them with resignation and courage, under the conduct of Mr. Albert Crompton. Its past is looked to for strength not for discouragement, as a motive for firmer resolution and closer union. The sacraments which have been administered in Liverpool during the year, the Sacraments of Initiation and Maturity, have brought the encouragement, the one of hope, the other of mature resolve, the expression of a deliberate decision spontaneously formed. There have been besides, in confirmation of the same results, two sacramental consecrations, rites supplementary to the regular Sacraments, the one sanctioning the enlargement of the natural family by the adoption into it of two fresh members as sisters, the other accepting from an older member of the congregation a more avowed adhesion and profession of obedience to the precepts of the Religion of Humanity. Such additional institutions I have on more than one occasion justified as required by our very complex society, and as beneficial in their degree, both to those who receive them and to the church in whose name they are conferred.

In Birmingham, combined action would seem very difficult at present.

Such effort as has been made has not hitherto been rewarded with success. Whether regular meetings at longer or shorter intervals, meetings of a purely friendly character, are possible or not, those on the spot must decide. But granting them impracticable and unprofitable under present conditions, I would urge on each Positivist in Birmingham the desirability of seeking to be in connection with all who share his faith or are inclined towards it. I need not remind them how constantly Auguste Comte urges on his disciples to be in contact with their fellow-disciples; how it was with this object, namely—the establishment of fraternal relations—that he instituted the Positivist Society. The essential want is a centre of contact, some one person, still better, some family, to bring one by one the scattered elements into union with itself and with each other, so forming a basis on which further and more public action might be surely grounded. In default of a sufficient centre Positivists need in no way slacken their efforts. Besides the intercourse on which I have touched, they can be industriously forming themselves by study and still more by thought, to a greater mastery of their faith intellectually, to be in all ways its truer disciples. Their opportunity will come sooner or later.

Till my visit to Newcastle in May last I had imperfectly realised the difficulties and discouragements, and therefore the perseverance, of Mr. Quin, during the last two or three years more especially. It seems almost inevitable that such persevering courage should eventually find a return. In fact I am not without hopes that the tide has already turned, that there is a perceptible lightening of the burden, for very great isolation is a burden, a tasking of the most resolute energy.

We have had much less intercourse with our Leicester co-religionists than could have been wished. There has, however, been some interchange of visits, to continue and promote the feeling of community. I am not aware of any change there in circumstance or action, any more than of any lessening of their convictions or chilling of their feelings. They rest on a very sound basis, and can afford to wait for an increase of numbers. The want in Leicester, as in Birmingham, is a Positivist, one, or better far a family, able to devote himself, or itself, to the steady furthering of the work.

In Brazil the activity of M. Lemos and his friends continues unabated. It is an anxious time, as the beginning of the new Republican order. As citizens they watch with interest and speak with directness on each question as it arises. On the details I cannot speak—the energy displayed I can admire, and its general direction as calculated to impress a right character on the movement. The United States of Brazil, whatever may be the difficulties which under conflicting influences they may have to meet, appear to be firmly established and out of reach of any Monarchical reaction. They have taken their place in the comity of Western nations, a new centre of Republicanism destined to exert a wholesome and peaceful attraction in the same direction on their European kindred. Their acknowledgment by the powerful Northern American State which bears the same title is not without significance under all these various aspects.

For ourselves in London the year has been much like the last. We had again to close our church for the summer months, allowing for the special festivals in August and September. Otherwise in all our work there has been a quiet continuance. I ought not to omit to mention the aid given us by Mr. Hutton during his visit to London. It was a relief under our pressure, and it was, independently of such consideration, pleasant as an expression of sympathy. In our estimate of what is done,

it is the outcome of the years, not the fluctuations of this or that year that we have to consider. We have to bear onward, leaving the question of success or failure to be answered by time.

In this connection I have to notice Mr. Blake's pamphlet. I regret that there should be any difference in such a quarter, but so much said, I can accept this as other attacks, and acquiesce in the sifting process which they bring with them. The principle which underlies the whole the principle of entire obedience to Auguste Comte, is one which I am glad to see acknowledged. Its application carries us very far.

Avoiding as far as possible all controversy, the more so as the letter to Mr. Quin imparts a considerable personal element into the discussion, I content myself with remarking that I do not accept the charge conveyed in the word *neglected*. We have not neglected the historical worship, on the contrary, we have kept it steadily in view, endeavouring to 'reconstruct in the West, the conception of, and respect for, the Past, as a whole.' We have endeavoured to spread 'a knowledge of the true philosophy of history and to attenuate as far as possible the several inconveniences of the historical worship,' most especially by the direct introduction of feeling. The very arrangement of our room, as of the rooms in connection with it, evidences the importance we attach to the historic basis, and an examination of the subjects of our addresses during the last twenty years would show that we have never disavowed ourselves from the provisional calendar.

The '*Appeal to Conservatives*' as a whole is meant for those who are not Positivists. The work meant for Positivists is the *Catechism*. It deals fully with their inner life and conduct. The *Appeal* treats of their action on those who are without. It directs the Positivist priesthood, when formed, how to deal with the outside world so far as it is capable of sympathising with the new Faith, without becoming adherents,— 'Magistrates, women, and even priests who are still sincerely attached to the old faith,'—whilst the *Catechism* is for those who are the adherents of the new. In other words the disciples of Auguste Comte are already in the normal state, not in the transition, or if in it, they are not of it. And it is to disciples more or less complete, but assumed to be striving towards completion, that we have spoken. That the *Catechism* is meant for immediate, present use is clear. I take the sentence at the top of page 25 (2nd Edition) 'For the present, it must serve as a general view, to prepare the way for the free acceptance of the religion, by a successful propagation, for which hitherto there was no systematic guidance available.'

That the particular form recommended in the *Appeal* is exclusive, prohibitory of all addition, is, in my judgment, a wholly untenable position. (See p. 27 of *Comte's Letters to me*.)

In this connection the letters to Mr. Edger are very useful. He was the only disciple who during Comte's life-time acted in any other way than by writing and completely private influence. We see in how free a spirit Comte treated his action. I notice the suggestion to the South American populations of a Positivist Service in honour of the Virgin. I notice also the curious fact that Comte approved of Mr. Edger's design of publishing the translation of the fourth volume of the *Politics* without the chapter on the Transition, as in the main superfluous for the North American public.

Looking back on my own work, I had to form as well as I could, the nucleus of a church (*Edger Letters*, p. 6). This I have done to the best of my ability. I remembered that we have, as a religious movement, to take over the inheritance of our predecessors, not to break the con-

tinuity of religious action. This has coloured my procedure. I leave it to be judged by others. One other consideration. There has been ever present with me, as with those who agree with me, the notion of a church union. And a church has in it not merely the old nor the adult even of either sex, nor is it confined to those on whom historical addresses of great beauty would tell, but it must welcome those, who, by their antecedents, are not amenable to historical conditions, and it must contain and provide for the young, for those who are growing up in the Faith. For this variety of wants a varied procedure was needed.

In the New Year's address for 1890 at Newton Hall, I notice merely the formal recognition of a definite bifurcation of those who profess the Religion of Humanity, and the preference by one division of M. Laffitte's direction to that of Auguste Comte. More I need not say. This judges the Newton Hall direction and those who accept it. As a direct disciple of Auguste Comte and bearing a commission from him, invested by him with the presidency of the English movement, I cannot hesitate in my rejection of such a substitution of M. Laffitte for Comte. The differences between the two are considerable, and I have no difficulty in choosing between them; in fact, I regard the whole attitude of the former, and of those who follow him, as obscuring the real issue, and delaying the progress of the new Religion, practically ignoring it as a Religion. It is indeed by virtue of this peculiarity that it commends itself to the world outside, which welcomes emancipation but is averse to religious obligation, prefers a vague ideal to a definitely traced duty.

Late in the year M. Lemos issued a short publication which does him honour. He had by a not unnatural error interpreted too absolutely as of immediate application the precept of our Master, as to the material property of the nascent Priesthood, and as may be remembered, he had brought his interpretation to bear on M. Laffitte, as on me also in his correspondence. So interpreted it involved the immediate renunciation by Priests, and that under present circumstances, of any thing coming to them by inheritance. Some unpublished letters of Auguste Comte to Dr. Foley contained a passage bearing on the subject which I sent to M. Lemos. He bows at once to the decision it contains. The extract is to this effect. 'In case of a fatal termination, which I hope you will prevent, it is incumbent on me to anticipate the generous conduct to which, without sufficient reflection, you have seemed to me at times disposed on the matter of inheritance, in regard to which you might be urged to an improvident renunciation. In the first place the regular engagement to that effect is only taken when receiving priestly ordination, and you are yet at a distance from that, firm as my conviction is that you will attain it. Above all we must consider that the rule is adapted for the normal state, and will not be applicable in the transition till such time as the Positivist fund shall completely guarantee their existence to the theoreticians, so that I should myself accept any share in my paternal inheritance, were that share larger than it will ever be.'

As M. Lemos says, the language is decisive, and can leave no doubt. And he well adds that the decision has an ulterior bearing, and must tell on our method of dealing with analogous cases, as also that the greater relativity which it introduces, or I should rather say sanctions, does not render the direction of our conduct an easier matter. This difficulty was foreseen by Auguste Comte, and to meet it he undertook the *Synthese Subjective* in order to leave us the moral and practical guidance, educational and industrial, by the help of which we might
 or our course. Its incompleteness binds on us the duty of most careful

examination of each case, for help in which, it is not to be forgotten, we have, according to Comte's judgment, all the principles given us in the works of his which we possess. What is needed is to search out those principles, combine them, and deduce from them the conclusions they will legitimately bear. In this task the mutual counsel of those who faithfully adhere to our Master's teaching is most needed.

In the United States of North America religious Positivism—the Religion of Humanity—is as yet confined to individual adherents. Their opinion is divided as to how far more is possible. More than one has been taken away by death who thought more distinctly possible. I cannot bring myself to believe that in a Western population, situated as the North American population is, with abundant difficulties in its social order, with a constant interchange of opinions and beliefs going on between it and Europe, there is no scope for the action of the Positive religion. It is possible, however, that a greater vitality must be shown by it in Europe before any large amount of attention will be given it in North America. Its disciples there, though few and scattered, will persist in any case, I make no doubt, and will both seek and take occasions for its propagation—tending rather to wait for and avail themselves of all openings that may present themselves than to more active intervention. I should imagine that the most desirable course would be the temperate application of the doctrines of our system to any of the more important questions which from time to time present themselves for discussion.

In Paris, on which, in the last resort, all depends, there is no essential change so far as I know. Dr. Lagarrigue perseveres in his arduous task without flinching. It must be a work of time, the circumstances are so unpropitious, the obstacles so many. The wish of us all must be that he may keep his health and vigour for the assertion of a cause the ultimate victory of which is secure, long as we may have to wait for its success. Time is bearing us away from some of the hindrances under which we have suffered. It is bearing us away for instance from the discouragement due to the failure of the nobler hopes which ushered in the revolutionary crisis, as also from the disastrous effects of the losses due to that crisis and its stormy course. It is bearing us away also from the more violent, unreflecting revolutionary tone of thought, its contempt for the medieval past, its dislike of all the religious antecedents of the West, its aversion to the very term religion.

If in the present the result is indifference, at times an almost cynical indifference, that is but a stage in the process of advance towards the due and temperate revision of previous judgments, as towards the resumption of the hopes and designs which attended the outset of the movement. The explanation of their failure is of itself a promise of a better achievement, and the demands of our time ensure their tacit but most certain resumption. On an outside world moving in this direction the servants of Humanity are called to act, and when the force of inertia has been once overcome, a slight but constant impulsion may tell very powerfully. Within themselves in possession of the full normal state, disciplined and trained in obedience to the teachings they have received, and guided by a great conception, they may be ever adding force to this originally slight impulsion. Seeing clearly what they want, they will come to impress on others its value. And it is quite true that in the present day the real difficulty lies rather in the clear perception of the needs of mankind than in the inability to attain them when perceived.

We may count then, sooner or later, and opinion moves rapidly, on a return to a more hopeful condition, on a change from indifference

to a determined and well guided purpose. But as I said above, it is on Paris that depends this resumption by the West of an orderly progress. What we ask is that there issue from Paris a true spiritual, religious, direction of the West, a direction which should keep constantly before men that it is not a question primarily of the higher instruction, or the renovation of the intellect, but that a deeper change is required, the substitution of a new religion for the as yet dominant but exhausted older faith. This should occupy the first place in all our efforts and expression. Paris must become in the highest sense the spiritual capital of the Western world. The acceptance of her initiative by the other nations, her whole legitimate influence, depends on this condition. By its fulfilment she would but be re-entering on the noble tradition which preceded the crisis of the revolution and which animated her during its earlier years.

RICHARD CONGREVE,

Born at Leamington Hastings, Warwickshire,

September 4th, 1818.

55, *Palace Gardens Terrace,*
Kensington, W.

(I.)—*The Sacerdotal Fund.*

	£	s.	d.
Balance from previous years	200	0	0
For 1889.....	116	5	1
Total	£316	5	1

(II.)—*Subscriptions for the year 102 (1890).*

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Occidental... 118	Minimum	0	1	0	306	3
	Mean	2	1	3		
	Maximum	50	0	0		
Oriental 17	Minimum	0	5	3	20	6
	Mean	1	3	10½		
	Maximum	5	5	0		
Total..... 135	Total	£326	10	6		

(III.)—*Expenses for the year 102 (1890).*

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
London Room:—						
Rent	55	0	0			
Gas, Firing, and Wages	31	12	0			
Various Items	1	1	4			
Social Meetings	1	10	0			
Organ	12	10	0			
Stove and Book-case	14	17	2			
				116	10	6
Newcastle Church				20	0	0
Mr. Quin				20	0	0
Leicester Room				6	0	0
Administration				30	0	0
Total Expenses.....				192	10	6
Balance				134	0	0
				£326	10	6

(IV.)—Amount for the year	£	s.	d.
90 (1878)	156	13	0
" " " 91 (1879)	260	0	0
" " " 92 (1880)	325	19	6
" " " 93 (1881)	283	16	11
" " " 94 (1882)	264	19	4
" " " 95 (1883)	320	12	6
" " " 96 (1884)	319	2	7
" " " 97 (1885)	302	15	10
" " " 98 (1886)	322	10	0
" " " 99 (1887)	330	15	9
" " " 100 (1888)	303	14	8
" " " 101 (1889)	317	14	10
" " " 102 (1890)	326	10	6

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

THE WESTERN REPUBLIC.

LIVE FOR OTHERS.

LOVE FOR PRINCIPLE
AND ORDER FOR BASIS;
PROGRESS FOR END.

LIVE OPENLY.

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL CIRCULAR; ADDRESSED TO EVERY SUBSCRIBER TO THE VOLUNTARY FUND INSTITUTED BY AUGUSTE COMTE ON BEHALF OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF HUMANITY.

London, 15 Moses 104 (15 January, 1892).

The formation of the Positive Priesthood is become the first condition of a renovation which is as imperatively demanded by order as by progress. Positivists at the outset had to ascend from faith to love, but henceforward they should give the preference to the more rapid and more effective method which leads downward from love to faith.

AUGUSTE COMTE.

SIR OR MADAM,

The statement of the accounts at the end of this Circular calls for only one or two remarks. The expense of the room in Chapel Street has been, it will be seen from them, larger than usual. On a sanitary inspection certain measures were ordered which involved a considerable outlay; all is now pronounced satisfactory in this important respect. The receipts show the ordinary variation. This year the number of subscriptions is slightly greater, the amount subscribed rather less.

I draw attention to one point. In the Circular for last year the balance was given as £134; as stated this year, under (I.), it is £114. The difference is owing to an error of omission in last year's accounts. The contribution to the Brazilian Chapel of Humanity was not taken into account—though mentioned in the body of the Circular.

I notice an increase in the number of those who need no reminder of the obligation to subscribe which they recognise. If each one would fix a day at his own choice on which to discharge this acknowledged duty, it would be well, and such day I could wish to fall *not in the last two months* of the year, but earlier.

Several of the publications of the year deserve mention.

- (1.) The translation of the introduction to the *Synthèse Subjective* places within the reach of those who do not read French a very important chapter of our Master's latest work—a chapter which throws light on his whole construction of the Universal Religion. The rest may wait, as meant for the teacher not the learner, and the competent teachers of mathematics or *logic* will certainly not be excluded from its use by their not possessing the French language.
- (2.) The new edition of the *Catechism* in French, issued by M. Lagarrigue as the representative in Paris of the Brazilo-Chilian group. It adopts from the Portuguese version the notes of M. Lemos. It has also (pp. v.-xiv.) an explanation of the motive for publishing it. I have thought it desirable that our Printing Fund should help in defraying the expenses of this work. It is always open to all to reprint any of Auguste Comte's works, on the sole condition of faithfulness to the original, and under existing circumstances a special issue of the *Catechism* by those who disagree very strongly with M. Laffitte is useful, as a clear announcement to the public that such disagreement aims at the substitution of a better direction for one which has gone astray.
- (3.) A new issue of the English translation was necessary, as a fire at the printer's had destroyed the remaining copies of the former edition. The change I have made in this edition is to leave the *Catechism* as it came from Auguste Comte, allowing for the change which he wished in the order. The Appendix, therefore, to the second edition disappears. A supplementary but distinct work to replace it, more adequate than the suppressed Appendix, remains a task for the immediate future.
- (4.) The translation of the *Catechism* into German by Herr Emil Roschlau, of Berlin: a translation, so far as I can judge, executed with the greatest care, and reproducing admirably the original, to which also it confines itself, to the exclusion of any supplement. We may hope for further contributions from the translator. No one of the year's publications exceeds this in interest. It is a great step this bringing within the reach of German readers of Auguste Comte's religious construction as it was expounded by himself in this short manual. The Positive Religion owes M. Roschlau much for his assistance.
- (5.) The *new Calendar of Great Men*, edited by F. Harrison. I offer no criticism on this work, for I have not examined it. It must be useful, as so many Positivists have not the means of gaining for themselves the information it contains, information which they must wish for.
- (6.) To the year belongs also the *Notice sur la Fête de l'Inauguration de la Chapelle de l'Humanité*, at Rio de Janeiro, by M. J. Mariano de Oliveira. The account of the proceedings on this occasion is of great interest, most particularly in regard to the absence of all hostility to the new institution on the part of the population. It testifies on the contrary to a very extensive friendly feeling, giving warmth to the whole ceremony. The position of the Brazilian Positivists in this respect contrasts strongly with the colder atmosphere in which we live and work, but is not therefore the less pleasant to read of.
- (7.) A new issue of the *Prayers* used in Chapel Street and elsewhere.

- (8). I have received, by the kindness of M. Roschlau, two or three German tracts in connection with Positivism. In themselves and by their quotations they confirm the impression created by the translation of the Catechism, that there is increasing attention paid to the system in Germany, that it is being freely discussed. The most important of the works sent me is a continuation, by Father Gruber, S.J., of his examination of Positivism. Last year we had his treatment of Auguste Comte; this year he treats of Positivism and the action of Positivists since the death of its author. As in the former so in this latter essay he shows great research in tracing the efforts made during the period under review. The survey is very comprehensive, including a long estimate of M. Littré's work, and extending to many writers in this country and elsewhere very indirectly connected with Positivism. The author has, it would appear, in dealing with those who profess in one degree or another to adhere to Comte's teaching, listened most to the representations of M. Laffitte and his followers; and the consequence is that his statements at times are, as regards those who differ, inaccurate, as a whole inadequate and untruthful, by virtue of the amount of suppression of facts. I see no reason to charge the writer with intentional unfairness. He has merely not kept clear of the illusion created by statements which he has taken as sufficient. He has not, I would add, made, so far as I am aware, any application for information to those who avow themselves complete disciples of Auguste Comte. I infer this from the consideration of his quotations. The result is a somewhat partisan exposition.

Naturally M. Gruber's summing up is highly condemnatory of the whole of Positivism. He concludes in favour of Roman Catholicism as the true Positivism—rejecting the relative in favour of the absolute Religion.

I have to mention with regret the loss of a valuable member of the Liverpool church—a devoted believer in the Religion of Humanity—one very quiet, but very firm—Mr. Walter Chambers Sterry. His presence was a source of strength from the steadfastness of his convictions, and his great kindness to all his co-believers. Confident in the ultimate triumph of the New Religion he longed, as we all long, for a more visible social result, which should impress our action more effectively on the outside world. The obstacles are great at present, but none can contest the soundness of the wish. Mr. Sterry's life and the suffering which had attended it had in short quickened not crushed his civic and social feelings. His past was a stimulus to labour for a better future.

Another death must not pass unrecorded. We lost in London last August, Mr. C. F. J. Lord, at a very advanced age. He was 87. He was a friend of Mr. Barton's, and had had his attention turned to Positivism by him. For many years he had subscribed to the Sacerdotal Fund, so marking a certain amount of adhesion. During the latest period of his life, under growing infirmity and in blindness, he was a constant attendant when able at the Sunday services in Chapel Street. His assent to the doctrines of our Religion was not complete; he had his reserves; and he was wont to dwell on the very slight recognition the new Faith gained. But he took pleasure and found support in a common worship which was free, as he expressed it, from superstition. He joined heartily in it, and often spoke of the satisfaction our meetings

gave him. All who saw him will long miss his fine presence and his sympathy.

Mr. Sterry and Mr. Lord have also much in common. Both discharged most faithfully their special functions. Mr. Lord, was for fifty years the active and efficient Officer of Health for Hampstead, was fearless and outspoken in that position, and especially keen in all that concerned the poor population of his district. Mr. Sterry spent his whole business life, forty-eight years, in the service of one firm, doing his duty with great fidelity and conscientiousness. Neither again had seen life on the easier side. Both were cognisant by their own experience of the prevalent disorder both in public and private life. Both had by nature, or in consequence of their experience, a certain irritability. Both also had a large stock of deeper-seated and most genuine kindness.

One word more. We have here two men in mature age, of strong characters and strong civic feeling, finding in the worship of Humanity as practised in Chapel Street and Liverpool that which they wanted in this respect for the trials of life. Their judgment is not without its value for us, when we hear, as we so often do, much insistence on the repulsion attaching to any form of religious worship, and our own in particular.

Turning to the various centres of Positivist action with which I am in connection, there is nothing very marked to record. We have had more than usual intercourse with Calcutta during the year, as Mr. Cotton spent some months in England, and gave us several addresses of great interest and usefulness in relation to English policy in India, and the right direction of opinion in England in regard to that policy. Indian gentlemen have also visited us, and placed more vividly before us the difficulties which attend the intermingling of the two countries. There has been no interruption of our correspondence.

Time brings changes in position, and the Indian Positivists will be thrown more on themselves for the future. The direction of the movement will be more in the hands of Babu Jogendra Chandra Ghosh, than he has hitherto wished it to be. There will be no change in the general policy adopted—any alterations will concern only the details of working. In Calcutta, as in London, distance is an important consideration and some central place of meeting becomes an object. This and the number and character of the meetings held are the details alluded to.

What we look for from those who in India co-operate with Western Positivists is the support of their sympathy in our task, not their full adoption of the Positivist system, least of all their breaking with their own traditions—a breach which would place them outside of their national life. The study of that life from within, and the endeavour to introduce from within such changes as time may indicate to be necessary, so preparing for the future development; these are the characteristic points in their activity. Everywhere it is the same aim at bottom, to act on opinion towards a modification of the actual state. One great central doctrine or truth has to be worked into the consciousness of India, the one central truth that all nations are parts of Humanity, bound to act towards one another under the control of their obligations to Her. There cannot be too great, too unceasing, an activity, on this point. If there is greater power vested in some than others, in the Western nations for instance, it is so vested for the good of others, and the feelings of those others, their just claims, are to be heard and taken into account. This suggests a difficulty as to the attempt to identify India with England. Does not such an identification tend to

lessen the force of any appeal to the West? It would seem the wisest plan for India to rest on herself and her past.

For those of her citizens who place themselves at the standpoint of Humanity, their acceptance of this central truth should bring no trouble into their lives. It should be an illumination and a guidance in their dealing with their present, not a disturbance of their whole social existence. This would be the waiting for the West, which Dwarka Nath Mitter saw to be the true attitude of India and the East generally.

On the relations of India with England I will not here say more than is implied in the question above stated. Nor is this the place to enter at length on the conduct of England towards India. The duty of English Positivists is more within my scope. That duty is in the main to act on the opinion around them, and in this direction generally, to strengthen every disposition there exists to do full justice to India. Such full justice would leave us but one answer to the fundamental question: How far is it right, or reasonable, to persist in imposing ourselves, not merely our rule, that is but one form of the evil, but our subversive instruction, our modes of thought, our social conclusions, all alike with ourselves in an unfinished, transitional state, upon another country. This is the issue at bottom, and it will more and more press itself forward. For the present it is wisest to urge repair of past mistakes. Reparation such as Rome could offer is out of the question. The fusion of the two populations in one Empire on a footing of equal citizenship is a pure delusion, but partial repair is within our power and to that we should seek to direct opinion. It is possible to reconstitute native states, here one and there one. It is possible to withdraw from recent acquisitions, as for instance from Upper Burmah. It is possible to surround ourselves with autonomous communities, freed from the evil of English residents, limiting our representatives to a diplomatic, as contradistinguished from a controlling, action. Such very general considerations are enough for my present purpose.

Our co-religionists in Brazil have been passing through a very trying time. The danger does not seem to have lain in any probability of a monarchical restoration, but in the attitude of the military Dictator to whom on the fall of the dynasty the Government was intrusted. Discontented with the relations between himself and the assembly, he ventured on a *coup d'état* with many of its usual accompaniments, the state of siege, prohibition of all criticism of the Government acts,—in short, complete suppression of all liberty of discussion,—threats being freely used where opposition was thought probable. Resistance began with the proletariat, and was seconded by the fleet and encouraged by support from one province after another. Thus the attempt was foiled and the Dictator in power resigned, the Vice-President becoming his successor in due course.

MM. Lemos and Teixeira Mendes, in their joint utterance as the apostles of Positivism in Brazil, accept gladly the present settlement. They consider that there was no justification whatever for the violent interference of the late Dictator. They would have wished a different form of government adopted originally, but in the one which was adopted there was sufficient provision for liberty of speech and writing, and a tolerable organisation of the state powers. In short, it was a condition of things quite endurable for the present, and giving scope for the gradual change which a wise action on public opinion would necessarily effect,—sufficient provision, therefore, for the future. Any inroad upon such a state in the interest of the personal power of one of the constituted authorities they judge to be a crime against the true interests of their

country. Their vigour and outspokenness exposed them to interference and danger during the short experiment. Its failure has consequently been a real relief. It lasted but twenty days, from November 3rd to November 23rd.

Leaving their judgment of the Brazilian crisis thus summarily indicated, it is of interest to observe how they estimate the course of events in the Transandine Republic of Chili.

From their point of view they consider the Chilian Revolution, which has set aside the more concentrated power of the President Balmaceda as a misfortune for that country, which he was governing in accordance with its best traditions. They deplore his suppression by a parliamentary body; in short, they think that the recent change involves for Chili the entrance into a condition both of less stability and less progress, and the little that transpires from ordinary sources appears to support this judgment—a judgment equally in either case duly relative to the peculiar circumstances of each country.

In the several English centres the state of things which I spoke of in my last circular has continued essentially unchanged. There has been a perseverance in action where action is practicable, there has been no receding where joint action is not as yet possible. There has been an increase in the direction of intercommunication where it has been possible, as for instance between Liverpool and Leicester, or as in the visits to London from Leicester and from Newcastle. Mr. Quin's presence and address evidenced the complete unity of purpose which presides over our combined action. The same may be said of Mr. Berry's visit. We remain few and deficient in strength and not without embarrassments resulting from such conditions, but in compensation there is a strengthening in many quarters of our inner union, a real warmth of co-operation.

I would notice also an enlargement of our operations, the foundation of a Positivist centre at Deptford under the care of Mr. Westbrook. In the immense area of London the multiplication of such centres is a great object, and scattered as we are each may look around him and see what is possible in his own district. Any initiative in this direction is most welcome.

In Chapel Street we have been obliged to have a break during the summer months, as we had last year. Our circumstances compel us to this. It is a necessity, however, which I much regret.

In general, as far as England is concerned, the main advance is still, and will be for some time, in the progress of opinion outside of us, in the greater or less influence the Positive Religion exercises on English thought and action,—in the indirect power of Positivism. Under this aspect, there is much that is satisfactory. If due in some measure to what is spoken of by observers as the general laxity of conviction that prevails on all religious subjects in the more educated community, the larger toleration which extends to us in common with all who stand aloof from the more traditional beliefs has a root also in the greater sympathy with all outspoken and sincere conduct, a sympathy often strongest where the opposite conclusions are most firmly held. All this makes the atmosphere in which we work pleasanter. This by the way. Whilst recognising the growth of our indirect influence and valuing it as preparatory, it must not be forgotten that it depends and must depend on the vigour and intensity of our own belief and practice, on our direct growth in a word. This growth need not be so much in the numbers as in the quality of the believers. Hence the importance of our

strengthening ourselves, with a comparative—only comparative—indifference to our numerical increase.

As regards any other groups professing Positivism in England, I will only say that they must stand or fall with the direction they accept, and for whose continued existence they are mainly responsible, or have been responsible hitherto. I have no means of knowing how far the later action of that direction—I refer exclusively to the year which is under review—may modify their view of it. It will be seen by my subsequent remarks that its teachings are in marked opposition on the larger political issues to all the doctrines formerly enunciated by its English adherents. Nor have I any reason to question their continued upholding of those doctrines. On all these points time will show what we have to meet.

Neither in regard to North America nor to Paris, if I confine myself to religious Positivism, is there anything to be said, so far as I am aware, different from what I said last year. The greatest patience is required in both cases for those who, as Dr. Lagarrigue in Paris, are the representatives of the Religion of Humanity.

Neither, again, is there any change in the demand made upon Paris by the Western, and through the West, by the Eastern world. The delay in meeting this demand bears heavily on the best interests of mankind.

I am not in this place concerned with the general policy of France or of the French Government, deeply as it must interest all members of the Western Republic. But with the policy and attitude of those who call themselves Positivists and disciples of Auguste Comte, the body which accepts the direction of M. Laffitte—with this I am concerned in a general survey of the events of last year—with this we are all concerned.

The March number of the '*Revue Occidentale*,' [March of last year, 103 (1891),] contains a statement of the policy of the above-mentioned group. On the Festival of Humanity that year M. Laffitte delegated to M. Jeannolle the task of delivering the annual address. Certain portions of the address so delivered are remarkable. They may fairly be taken as representing M. Laffitte's own conclusions; first, because they are the utterances of his delegate; secondly, because they are reproduced in the Review which M. Laffitte directs. Under these circumstances we are surely warranted in treating them as an exposition of the teaching of the Laffittist group.

From the *Revue* I extract the whole passage, to which I more particularly refer, in the original, and I add a translation of it:—

'Par exemple, et c'est ici que je termine, nous ne devons pas imposer à la France, sous prétexte qu'elle est l'avant-garde de l'Humanité et qu'elle contient en germe les destinées de celle-ci, des devoirs et une tâche qui ne sauraient appartenir qu'à l'Humanité elle-même ou tout au plus à la République occidentale, en les supposant constituées. Nous ne devons pas non plus exiger d'elle, à la façon des démocrates, qu'elle se fasse partout et toujours le champion du droit, quoiqu'il puisse advenir, ni qu'elle donne au monde étonné l'exemple de vertus dont se dispensent les autres peuples. Il ne faut pas que la France soit le Don Quichotte des nations; elle ne s'en relèverait pas. Nous devons aussi faire avec soin la différence des situations et ne pas lui demander d'agir comme si elle avait encore la prépondérance qu'elle a perdue. Enfin, nous devons considérer que nos hommes d'État ont pour devoir de ne se préoccuper que des intérêts français, que l'égoïsme national est pour eux la première des vertus. N'allons pas compliquer leur tâche, déjà si difficile, en leur attribuant des fonctions qui n'appartiennent qu'à

'un pouvoir spirituel organisé: celle, par exemple, de faire céder, uniquement par ce qui serait juste, les intérêts de la France devant les prétentions, même légitimes, d'une nation rivale, sans exiger une compensation au moins équivalente.'

(*Translation.*) 'For instance, and here I end, we ought not to impose on France, on the plea that she is the vanguard of Humanity and has within her in germ the future destinies of Humanity, duties and a task which can belong only to Humanity herself, or at most to the Western Republic, supposing the two constituted. Nor ought we to require of her, as the democrats do, that she stand forward everywhere and at all times as the champion of right, come what may; nor that she offer the astonished world the example of virtues from which all other nations exempt themselves. France must not be the Don Quixote of nations; she would fall beyond recovery. We ought also carefully to allow for difference of positions, and not ask her to act as though she still had the preponderance she has lost. Lastly, we ought to consider that the duty of our statesmen is to attend exclusively to French interests—that national egoism is for them the first of virtues. Let us not complicate their task, already so difficult, by assigning them functions which attach only to an organised spiritual power—the function, for instance, of waiving, solely from the consideration of what would be just, the interests of France in favour of the claims, even the legitimate claims, of a rival, without exacting at least an equivalent concession in compensation.'

I am not concerned with the incidental grains of truth this language contains. I have to deal with its general outcome. It adjourns indefinitely any hope that its author and those whom he represents will aid in promoting a really Western policy. It amounts to this, that a body of men calling themselves disciples of Auguste Comte renounce for the present for France the initiative which he claimed for her and which all Positivists in other nations are willing to acknowledge, only anxious that she should exert it. It is the explicit sanction by the same body of the spirit of national egoism in the government which they ought to guide in quite a different direction.

To give the utterance its full significance, we must remember that it was made on the Festival of Humanity in the first Temple of her Religion, under all the pressure of the associations connected with Auguste Comte's rooms, his life and teaching. The opportunist consecration of actual human disunion chose singularly ill its time and place.

What we ask, I said last year, is that there issue from Paris a true spiritual, religious, direction of the West, a direction which should keep constantly before men that it is not a question of the higher instruction, or the renovation of the intellect, but that a deeper change is required, the substitution of a new religion for the as yet dominant but exhausted older faith. This should occupy the first place in all our efforts and expression. Paris must become, in the highest sense, the spiritual capital of the Western world. The acceptance of her initiative by the other nations—her whole legitimate influence depends on this condition. By its fulfilment she would but be re-entering on the noble tradition which preceded the crisis of the Revolution, and which animated her during its earlier years.

The extract given meets this demand with the completest negative. We can only feel glad that from all complicity with those from whom it emanates we are—and have long been—completely free. Positivism of such a kind is indeed the salt that has lost its savour. We have to wait for its disappearance, for its slow displacement by a nobler substitute.

This is the costly price we pay for the non-acceptance in full of our religious inheritance.

RICHARD CONGREVE,
Born at Leamington Hastings, Warwickshire,
4 September, 1818.

This circular is late, which I regret. It was begun at the usual time, but has been delayed by circumstances beyond my control.

55, Palace Gardens Terrace, London, W.

24 Aristotle 104 (20 March 1892).

(I.)—*The Sacerdotal Fund.*

Balance from previous years	£200	0	0
„ for 1890	114	0	0
Total.....	£314	0	0

(II.)—*Subscriptions for the Year 103 (1891.)*

		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Occidental 124	(Minimum	5	1	0	293	17	11
	Mean	2	7	4			
	Maximum	50	0	0			
Oriental ... 18	(Minimum	0	4	6	17	13	0
	Mean	0	19	7			
	Maximum	3	15	0			
Total... 142	Total.....	311	10	11			

(III.)—*Expenses for the Year 103 (1891.)*

London Room, ORDINARY expenses:—	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Rent and Insurance	55	9	0	150	8	2
Gas, Firing and Wages.....	34	7	5			
Various Items	2	8	0			
Social Meetings	1	8	11			
Organ	12	10	0			
EXTRAORDINARY: (1) Sanitary	32	5	4			
(2) Cleaning	11	19	6			
Newcastle	25	0	0			
Leicester Room.....	6	0	0			
Administration	30	0	0			
Total Expenses	211	8	2			
Balance	100	2	9			

£311 10 11

(IV.)—Amount for the year 90 (1878)	156	13	0
„ „ „ 91 (1879)	260	0	0
„ „ „ 92 (1880)	325	19	6
„ „ „ 93 (1881)	283	16	11
„ „ „ 94 (1882)	264	19	4
„ „ „ 95 (1883)	320	12	6
„ „ „ 96 (1884)	319	2	7
„ „ „ 97 (1885)	302	15	10
„ „ „ 98 (1886)	322	10	0
„ „ „ 99 (1887)	330	15	9
„ „ „ 100 (1888)	303	14	8
„ „ „ 101 (1889)	317	14	10
„ „ „ 102 (1890)	326	10	6
„ „ „ 103 (1891)	311	10	11

APPENDIX.

For these Translations of some French correspondence, see pp. 86—91.

M. EMILE LAPORTE TO MR. CONGREVE,

The Positivist Society of Paris at its meeting on 28 Caesar 91 (20 May 1879), decided that, in view of the fact that its main object is to pave the way for and support the action of the spiritual direction in the establishment of Positive doctrine and in the application of Positive politics, the breach with that direction which you have publicly made by your circulars, as well as the disagreement you have expressed with respect to the propagandist methods which the Positivist Society uses and which are the chief features in its action, no longer form a sufficient community of views for the continuance of your co-operation with this group; and that, consequently, on these grounds, it was advisable to request your resignation as a member of the Positivist Society of Paris.

The majority of the Positivists who held this opinion and in whose name I notify it to you, specially instructed me to assure you that no motive of personal antipathy prompted them to come to this decision, but simply the desire to avoid being distracted from our social action by internal dissension unbecoming the great work we pursue; that, on the contrary, so far as regards yourself personally, though they deeply regret the severance of your connection, they will ever have a pleasant remembrance of you and will ever be grateful to you for the great services you have rendered to Positivism.

Salutation and respect,

EMILE LAPORTE,

Working Mechanic.

80, Rue Vanneau,

Vice-President of the Positivist Society of Paris.

R. CONGREVE TO M. LAPORTE,

At last I answer your letter of 6 St. Paul, 91 (26 May, 1879). I have perhaps been somewhat too tardy, but it was better to give oneself time.

I am very sensible of the manner in which you have acquitted yourself of a summons which must have been painful to you if you remember all that has passed. I thank you for it, regretting, however, that you did not act similarly towards our two eminent co-religionists, Doctors Audiffrent and Sémérie, for such they are after all, and that title should have made you hesitate.

I observe that it is not the President of the Positivist Society who invites me to withdraw, and it is open to me to doubt the validity of an invitation emanating from any but the President. My doubt is strengthened by Dr. Audiffrent's letter, who is much better informed than I am as to the constitution of the Society; but I do not press the point.

Then, is the Positivist Society as Auguste Comte constituted it in

existence? In this connection I quote to you a passage from the address by M. Laffitte, on 4 Frederic, 89 (8 November, 1877), according to Mr. Dubuisson's version, which has been accepted by M. Laffitte and has circulated among the Positivists, 'The Positivist Society, as it at present exists, has not this object (of politics): they are *friends* (the underlining is Mr. Dubuisson's) who meet together on Wednesdays with the Director of Positivism, for the purpose of seeing one another and talking about the matters which interest them. It is a drawing-room, not a club.' That is not exactly the character of the Positivist Society, and such a meeting of friends is hardly competent to act in its name.

For a long time past, the Wednesday meeting has had a mixed character, though retaining its original name. My going to it was an act of Positive fraternity, in spite of any differences we had and in accordance with the statements in my first circular. The reception I met was not such as to make me go again; but withdraw from the Positive Society—No. I prefer to leave to that meeting, such as it is, the responsibility of the initiative.

You acknowledge that there are obligations to me, and, in fact, I have rendered some services. Let what will be said of me, the facts remain—it is due to my persistent efforts for a long series of years that you have been enabled even to retain your meeting place—the figures vouch for the truth of what I state—and that is only a trifling part of the constant support I gave the direction we had up to 90 (1878).

One word as to the spiritual direction of Paris. For me it is as ever in the works of Auguste Comte; sooner or later they will judge us. I have never wavered. From the very first I have followed his directions, putting the church before the school, the worship before teaching. Am I wrong, am I right, at the present time? This is certain—that I keep to the Master's tradition. And on the high question thus raised I utterly deny the competence of the meeting which you represent.

I will in conclusion say that there was a better course open to your group. That was, to do nothing that could increase the tension, to urge to union rather than separation. That is the aim I have set before myself within the limits of what is possible. I ask you to help me in it.

I shall not forget the goodwill which, as the spokesman of your majority, you express towards me. I value it much.

Salutation and fraternity,

RICHARD CONGREVE.

(I shall print both our letters.)

PARIS 13 HOMER 92

(10 February, 1880).

M. LAFFITTE TO MR. CONGREVE.

MY DEAR MR. CONGREVE,

I have just read a pamphlet, published by M. Sémérie, on the subject of Article 7 of Mr. J. Ferry's Bill. In this pamphlet the author indulges in some judgments of me, which violate all propriety as regards what is due to a man whom M. Sémérie has for twenty years declared to be his chief and master, and towards whom, in accordance with universal custom, he should, at the very least, have respected a long past of habitual intercourse.

I was able, my dear Mr. Congreve, to accept, in the name of your group, your participation in the subsidy to myself, which on your side was a strict moral obligation, as you duly acknowledged, but which, as discharged in spite of our differences, did honour to Positivism by proving that its adherents fulfilled their duty without being overborne by the disturbing influence of the contest. I was able, I say, to accept this subsidy, despite the violence of expression of some of your French adherents in the attacks, which I attributed to the heat of the first stage. But this is no longer the case; this outburst occurs more than two years after; it is therefore impossible for me to receive any personal contribution in the name of your group, unless the author of the pamphlet be personally excluded from all share in that contribution. In taking this step I remain in the entirely defensive attitude which I have always preserved and shall always preserve, knowing too well the deep moral obligation which I have contracted to devote all my strength to the service of the Religion of Humanity, without diverting the least part of it on personal quarrels of which posterity will be the judge.

Yours truly,
P. LAFFITTE.

MR. RICHARD CONGREVE.

17 MECKLENBURGH SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.
21 *Homer* 92 (18 February, 1880).

MR. CONGREVE TO M. LAFFITTE.

DEAR M. LAFFITTE,

Though dated 10 February, I did not receive your letter until the evening of the 13th.

Had it rested with me, as my French friends would acknowledge, many things would have been suppressed, and I will say further, have been suppressed. I have always done what I could to restrain rather than to urge forward. My desire is to preserve the greatest moderation in expression. As to the substance I reserve my judgment.

But have you maintained an entirely defensive attitude. Allow me to quote your last circular, *p.* 14, the paragraph—*Quand je dis, etc.* ('When I say that the group which Mr. Congreve now directs is 'purely British, it is well understood that I do not speak in an absolute 'manner, since some persons in France have followed him, persons, 'however, having but little influence on the Positivist milieu and 'apparently not likely to have any greater on the surrounding public.') The contemptuous tone that you exhibit is little in agreement with the attitude you claim and little suited to conciliate opponents. Do you therein respect your past with Messrs. Audiffrent and Sémérie? In any case it is only too natural that those whom you judge to have so little importance should retort and attempt to prove you wrong. And the objection might be made to you: if they have so little hold upon the public, why do you disturb yourself.

I must add that towards myself in England you have scarcely kept a purely defensive attitude. Your advice has been decidedly aggressive.

For the rest, our group is connected by general sympathies, with a certain disagreement, and at an early stage I carefully pointed out the action, not directorial but consultative, that I reserve to myself. In my circular on the present Positivist organisation I also indicated my sub-

ordination to Dr. Audiffrent, in the event of his consenting to take, and of his taking in an effectual way, the direction in Paris.

For me the Positivist unity remains intact, we merely group ourselves freely as we please. And I do not understand the tone of excommunication which prevails among your adherents and a little also with yourself.

As regards the subsidy, according to your figures, the modest sum that you ask for personal maintenance will be reached, at least I believe so, for your sacerdotal subsidy should take precedence, should it not, of the general expenses; an arrangement which would practically solve the difficulty.

But nothing is clearer: your acceptance of our offer is optional, and you can attach your own conditions to it. The condition which you seek to bind on me, the personal exclusion of Mr. Sémérie from our group—for that is, is it not, the final effect of your letter—is not acceptable; as you yourself, I think, in fact consider it. It is one thing to regret an attack, another to break with him who has made it. I have myself put up with so many, and more serious ones. Nothing is more natural than that you should break with him, but to exact it from others—we should never have done. Are you not in close union with Mr. Harrison, who has implicitly told me that I lied? It would be an internecine war, and scarcely in the interest of Positivism.

I accept the small work on mathematics, but renew my protest against its publication, believing it to be untimely, if not forbidden. But this said I will receive it and thank you. Let us have patience.

Yours truly,

RICHARD CONGREVE.

P.S.—2 Aristotle 92 (27 February, 1880). I add to this letter of the date of 21 Homer the acknowledgment of the receipt of the little book, with my thanks. You will, I doubt not, publish my reply at the same time. I wish you to do so.

RICHARD CONGREVE.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
[REDACTED]
3 0010 0000 7510

**DO NOT REMOVE
OR
MUTILATE** 

